THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXX.—OCTOBER, 1905—No. 120.

THE EARLY RELATIONS OF RUSSIA AND JAPAN.

Muller, G. Fr., Sammlung Russischer Geschichte, 1732.

Langsdorf, G. H. von, Bemerkungen auf einer Reise um die Welt in den Jahren 1803 bis 1807. Frankfurt am Main, 1812.

Krusenstern, A. von, Voyage Round the World in the years 1803, 1804, 1805 and 1806. London, 1813.

Golonin, V. A., Narrative of my Captivity in Japan, London, 1818.

Golonin, V. A., Recollections of Japan. Followed by an account of the voyages of Messrs. Chwostoff and Davidoff. London, 1819.

Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan. Yokohama, 1872.

THE conquest of Kamtchatka, which was carried out between the years 1697 and 1706 by Vladimir Atlassoff, a colonel of Cossacks, extended the Russian Empire to the shores of the Northern Pacific, within a few weeks' sail of Japan, and thus established it in a position where it would inevitably be soon brought into very close relations with the Japanese Government. This advance was not, however, immediately followed by any endeavor to enter into a treaty with the Mikado and the Shogun, or to induce them to abandon the policy of rigorous seclusion from the outer world which had been adopted by their predecessors in the early part of the seventeenth century. The aims of Peter the Great and of his successor, the Empress Catherine I., were limited to the acquisition of a more thorough knowledge of the northern and eastern coasts of Asia and of the western coast of America, as well as of the islands which might be discovered in the North Pacific and in the Arctic Ocean. Several expeditions were therefore dispatched for this purpose in various directions, and the first,

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1905, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

which was destined for Japan, was that led by Captain Spangberg and Lieutenant Walton, who in 1739, under the reign of the Empress Anna Ivanovna, sailed from the port of Okhotsk, in Siberia, with four small vessels; but the object of these officers was merely to ascertain the difference in longitude between Kamtchatka and Japan, and with the exception of landing at various places for the purpose of obtaining water, when they were invariably courteously received by the inhabitants, they did not seek to hold any communication with the Japanese people.

In the course of the following years Russian merchants frequently visited the Island of Yezo and the Kurile Islands, but no attempt was made to establish diplomatic relations with Japan until the year 1792, towards the end of the reign of the Empress Catherine II., when Kokaku (1780-1817) reigned as Mikado at Kioto and Iyanori (1787-1838) as Shogun at Yedo. There was then residing in Siberia a Japanese merchant named Kodai, who had been wrecked some time previously on one of the Aleutian Islands, and had been brought to Irkutsk, together with his crew. The Empress heard of him and thought that through his means it might be possible to open negotiations with Japan and obtain for Russia a share of the commercial privileges of which the Dutch had for so long enjoyed a monopoly. He was therefore invited to St. Petersburg, where he was treated with great hospitality and shown the splendor of the imperial court, so as to impress him with a high opinion of the power and wealth of Russia. As, however, the Empress could not feel certain that her friendly overtures would be favorably received, she instructed the Governor General of Siberia, General Pihl, to write in his own name to the Emperor of Japan (the title which foreign nations then gave to the Shogun), and to send the letter by an officer of inferior rank. A lieutenant of the imperial navy named Adam Laxmann was selected for this mission. In September, 1792, he sailed from Okhotsk with the Japanese, who were to be restored to their native land, and on October 7 he anchored in the Bay of Nemuro, on the northern coast of the Island of Yezo, where he passed the winter. He was well received by the Ainos, the aboriginal inhabitants of the island, but the Japanese officials watched him closely, and it was not until the month of April that he received permission to sail to Hakodate and to go from thence by land to Matsumai, the capital of the province, where he was to remit the shipwrecked sailors to the Viceroy. There Laxmann was informed by the delegates sent by the Shogun that by entering a Japanese port other than that of Nagasaki the Russians had rendered themselves liable, according to the laws of the State, to perpetual imprisonment, but that as

they were unaware of the existence of these laws, and had, moreover, been sent by their government to bring some Japanese subjects back to their country, an exception to the rule would be made in their case, and they would be allowed to return to Russia. The delegates also stated that Japan had no knowledge of the degree of greatness to which the Russian Empire had attained or of the manners and customs which prevailed there, and that no other answer could be given to the letter from Russia than by receiving the sailors who had been cast away, and on whose account it had been written; any further intercourse was therefore not desired. Laxmann was, however, given a document authorizing one Russian ship at a time to enter the port of Nagasaki for the purpose of trading, but on condition that during its stay no act of divine worship should be performed on board, as the exercise of the Christian religion could not be tolerated in Japan.

The prolonged state of warfare into which Europe was plunged shortly after 1792 as a result of the French Revolution prevented the Russian Government from availing itself of this permission for many years, and it was not until 1803 that the Czar Alexander I. was able to renew the attempt to enter into a treaty of commerce with Japan. To carry out this intention he took advantage of an expedition which was being got ready for a voyage to the far East by the Russian-American Company, an association of merchants formed towards the end of the eighteenth century to trade with the Russian possessions in the Aleutian Islands and in Alaska. Captain Adam Johann von Krusenstern, an officer of the imperial navy, who had served in the English fleet from 1793 to 1799, was given the command of two vessels which had been purchased in London for this undertaking—the Nadeshda (The Hope), of 450 tons, and the Neva, of 370—and Count Nicolai Petrovich von Rezanoff, one of the imperial chamberlains, was appointed Ambassador to the Court of Japan. He was accompanied by some scientific men, among whom may be specially noted Dr. George Heinrich von Langsdorff, to whom, as well as to Captain von Krusenstern, we owe an interesting account of the voyage; and he also took with him, in the hope of assuring a favorable reception for his mission, some Japanese fishermen who had been wrecked on the Aleutian Islands a few years after the return of Laxmann.

The expedition sailed from Cronstadt on August 7, 1803, and after stopping for some weeks at Copenhagen, Falmouth, Teneriffe and the Island of Sta. Catherina, on the coast of Brazil, it doubled Cape Horn on March 3, 1804, reached Nukahiva on May 6 and cast anchor on July 15 in the harbor of Petropavlovsk, in Kamtchatka. From thence Captain von Krusenstern continued his

journey on September 7 with the Nadeshda only, steering towards Japan with the aid of incorrect charts, through a sea at that time almost unknown to Europeans. He sighted the southern point of the Island of Shikoke on the 28th and reached the entrance of the Bay of Nagasaki on October 8.

The approach of the Nadeshda as it cruised along the coast had been signaled to Nagasaki by fires lighted on the hills, and as soon as it was brought to, a boat came alongside with two officials, who asked the Japanese on board many questions with regard to the nationality of the vessel, for what purpose it had come and whether it carried any arms. They were shown the permission to visit the port which had been given to Laxmann, of which they took a copy, and asked why it had not been made use of until then. Towards evening two other officials came to point out the spot, about three-quarters of a mile from the land, where the ship might anchor, and a guard of thirty-two boats, bearing flags on which were the arms of the Prince of Fisen, the local Daimio, was stationed at from fifty to a hundred yards round her, forming a circle which no one was allowed to pass, while three others were placed close to the vessel, in readiness to transmit the captain's demands in case he required provisions or interpreters. Late that night two magistrates of superior rank, one of them being the Governor's secretary ("Opper Bunyos," or "great lords" as they were called by the Dutch-speaking Japanese interpreters who accompanied them), came on board with a numerous retinue. They were received with military honors and were presented to the Ambassador in the cabin, where they seated themselves cross-legged on the sofa, while their servants placed lanterns before them as well as a vessel containing hot embers, another holding tobacco and a spittoon. The interpreters knelt in a semi-circle in front of them, and when one of them spoke to the magistrates he threw himself forward on his hands, bending down his head, and ended his communication by drawing in his breath two or three times with a hissing noise, when the Bunyo replied in an extremely low voice hardly audible to the Russians. At this interview the questions which had been asked by the previous visitors were again repeated and the answers taken down in writing; but the new-comers seemed also very anxious to learn how many days had been employed to make the voyage from Kamtchatka, and if the vessel had passed between Corea and Japan, and they seemed much relieved on finding that it had sailed along the eastern coast.

When this interrogatory had lasted for upwards of an hour the magistrates mentioned to von Resanoff that Mynheer Doeff, the "Opperhoofd" or director of the Dutch factory, together with his

secretary, the captains of two Dutch ships then in the harbor and Baron von Pabst, a traveler of the same nationality, asked permission to visit him, and the fact that these gentlemen had been obliged to wait in their boat alongside the ship until it pleased the Japanese officials to admit them is a remarkable specimen of the humiliations to which the Dutch merchants submitted in order to purchase by their subserviency the exclusive right of trading with Japan. Their reception by the Japanese was equally contemptuous, for they had hardly entered the cabin when they were called upon by the interpreters to do homage to the magistrates by the words: "*Mynheer Opperhoofd, compliment voor de Opper Bunyos,*" "Mr. Director, pay your respects to the higher Bunyos," and were obliged to stand bent almost at a right angle, with their arms hanging, until told by the interpreters that the ceremony was ended. On the occasion of a second visit to the Nadeshda, when the treasurer, the secretary of the Governor and a magistrate were present, the "*compliment*" seemed to Heer Doeff to be unduly prolonged, and becoming impatient he asked the interpreter: "*Kan ik wederom opstaan?*" "May I stand up again?" At the end of the same interview Baron von Pabst tried to leave the cabin without being perceived, and thus avoid this degrading custom, of which he highly disapproved, but an interpreter called after him: "*Heh! Mynheer von Pabst, eer je weg gaat moet je de Groote Heeren een compliment maaken.*" "Oh! Mynheer von Pabst, before you go you must salute the great Lords." And he had to come back and perform the ceremony. At this second interview the Japanese officials informed the Ambassador that, according to a very ancient law, all the arms and ammunition on board should be given up to the government, to be held in trust until the departure of the vessel, to which von Resanoff consented, with the exception of the officers' swords and the arms of the seven soldiers who formed his guard of honor. The former of these demands was readily granted, but the latter was so opposed to all the usages of Japan that no answer could be given until instructions had been received from Yedo.

It was only on these two occasions that the Russians were allowed to hold any communication with the Dutch. Even when the two Dutch vessels left for Batavia on November 8 it was only as an exceptional favor that von Resanoff obtained permission to send by them a letter to the Czar; but it had first to be submitted to the Governor of Nagasaki and a copy of it, together with a translation into Dutch, left with him. It was then returned to the Ambassador to be sealed in presence of two of the Governor's secretaries, by whom it was brought back again to the Governor, who handed it to the Dutch captains. These officers were also strictly

forbidden to acknowledge even by a word the greeting of Captain von Krusenstern as their ship passed his, and when he hailed them to wish them a happy voyage they could only reply by waving their speaking trumpets.

The letter from the Czar, which von Resanoff was to present to the Shogun Iyenori, and a copy of which was demanded by the Governor of Nagasaki to send to Yedo, was the subject of considerable discussion. It was written in Russian, Japanese and Manchu, but the Japanese translation had been made by one of the shipwrecked fishermen and the officials declared that they were unable to understand it, as the writing was very bad and the language mostly unintelligible. It had therefore to be explained to the interpreters sentence by sentence with the help of the Dutch language, with which the Russians were only imperfectly acquainted. It stated that the Emperor of Russia thanked the Emperor of Japan for the permission to send a ship to Nagasaki, and informed him that for the advantage of his subjects in Kamtchatka, Alaska, the Aleutian and the Kurile Islands he wished to enter into a treaty of commerce with Japan, which he trusted would also be of great benefit to the Japanese themselves; and he had, therefore, given orders that the Japanese should be received at all times and in every part of his dominions in the most friendly manner. The letter ended by thanking the Shogun for the kindness shown to Lieutenant Laxmann in 1793, and by requesting him to accept some presents which might serve to give an idea of the products of Russian industry. The fact that the Emperor of Russia wrote this letter himself caused the Japanese much surprise, for it is a thing which the sovereign of Japan never does; even the name of their Emperor, they said (by which they probably meant the Mikado), was kept secret during his lifetime, and it was only after the death of the ruler that the people knew who had reigned over them.

During all the time the Russians stayed at Nagasaki the vigilance with which the Nadeshda was watched was never relaxed for a moment; and though crowds of sightseers were brought out every day from the town to view the ship, the line of guard boats kept them at a distance, and all communication with the visitors or the shore was forbidden. The Russians could not but feel that they were treated as prisoners, and von Resanoff, who had expected to enjoy a little more liberty than the Dutch merchants, complained bitterly of the restraint to which he was subjected. His health suffered from his prolonged confinement on board ship, and he requested to be allowed to take exercise on shore. He also asked to have the use of a house for the purpose of unpacking and putting

in order the presents he had brought for the Emperor of Japan, as well as a place where the ship could be repaired. The Governor of Nagasaki professed the utmost willingness to comply with these demands, but observed that the laws of Japan forbade any stranger to land without a special permission from the Shogun; nevertheless, on account of the great esteem he had for the Ambassador, he would make an exception in his favor and allow him to have access to a place where he might walk. The spot selected was on the shore of the Bay of Kibashi, not far from where the Nadeshda was moored; and there a space not more than twice the length of the ship and about forty paces wide was enclosed on the side next the land with a palisade of bamboos; every plant and blade of grass was torn up, the soil leveled and strewn with sand. A small wooden shed served as a shelter in case of rain, and two guard houses were built close by. The Ambassador on being granted this concession was requested never to take with him more than nine officers, to allow no sailors to land nor to let any one pass the night on shore. It was only on these conditions that he was allowed this trifling amount of liberty.

After the departure of the Dutch ships the Nadeshda was towed to the anchorage which they had occupied off the little Island of Deshima, where the Dutch factory had been situated since the year 1641, and near a place called Megasaki, where, after protracted negotiations, von Resanoff was at last allowed to reside. The slowness of these proceedings caused the Russians much irritation, and Captain von Krusenstern remarks that the Japanese took every step with the utmost circumspection, as if the least error would cost the life even of the persons highest in rank, and that every thought, every question, every word was weighed in the nicest manner and appeared to have some particular aim in view. The Governor of Nagasaki, indeed, tried to account for the delay by alleging the length of time required to communicate with the capital and the impossibility of allowing the Ambassador to land without orders from his superiors, but von Resanoff learned afterwards from the interpreters that the real reason was that the question of holding any communication with the Russians was considered so important that the Shogun could come to no decision on the subject without consulting the Mikado, and that he had sent the latter an embassy to ascertain his views.

It was not until December 17 that von Resanoff, accompanied by ten officers and fifteen other persons, comprising his guard of seven soldiers, took up his abode at Megasaki, and he was conveyed there with every demonstration of respect in the state barge of the Prince of Fisen. This splendidly ornamented boat, 120 feet long, was built

in two stories; the outside of the upper one was hung with stuffs of many colors, and that of the lower with lilac silk bearing the Prince's arms. The partitions of the rooms into which it was divided were lacquered and inlaid with the same device in gold, and the floors were covered with rich carpets. Large numbers of soldiers under arms were ranged on a hill close to the landing place, the neighboring fortifications were decorated with flags and hangings and thousands of spectators covered the shore. The Ambassador on alighting from the barge was received by a Japanese guard of honor and several magistrates, who showed him the greatest courtesy. An ample supply of provisions had been sent to the house for his use, the fire was burning and water was boiling in the kitchen, but when he had been installed in his new dwelling and the Japanese officials had left, the doors were locked and bolted and the Russians found that they were in a closely guarded prison.

The building where they were confined stood upon a small promontory advancing into the sea and occupied three sides of a courtyard about fifty paces in length and forty in breadth; it was surrounded by a high bamboo fence, even on the side next the sea, which shut out all view of the neighboring country, though after some time they were allowed the use of a somewhat larger enclosure. The boats of the Prince of Fisen were stationed in front of the gate leading to the sea, and an imperial civil guard, as well as a military guard furnished by the troops of the Prince of Omuru, watched the door leading to the town. These latter soldiers were soon withdrawn by the express command of the Shogun, but it was only after repeated remonstrances that von Resanoff obtained leave to hold unrestrained communication with the members of the expedition who had remained on board the Nadeshda and without being obliged each time to inform the Governor of Nagasaki, though it was still necessary on these occasions to give notice to the officers on guard by hoisting a red flag so as to have the inner and outer fastenings of the doors removed. Every evening, too, the Russians were passed in review, to make sure that neither more nor less than the number agreed on were present. On the other hand, provisions of the best quality were furnished gratuitously to the embassy, and all the materials required by Captain von Krusenstern for the repairs of the ship were immediately procured for him, but a special permission from the Governor of the city was requisite to enable the Russians to make any purchase, and this permission was often refused.

After waiting impatiently in his new residence for some months, von Resanoff at last insisted upon obtaining a decisive answer with regard to his reception, or at least on being given the reasons why

it was deferred. He was then informed by the interpreters that the Shogun and the Mikado were not yet agreed on that question; that they were still negotiating with each other; that the Shogun had summoned a council at Yedo to discuss the advisability of establishing commercial relations with Russia, and that this indecision was the cause of the delay. It was not until March 12 that he learned that he would not be allowed to proceed to Yedo, and that an envoy of much higher rank than the Governor of Nagasaki was already on his way to treat with him. On the arrival of this functionary a long discussion ensued through the intermediary of the interpreters with regard to the ceremonial to be observed at the audience. Von Resanoff positively refused to submit to the degrading formalities demanded by the Japanese, and obtained as a special favor to be allowed to salute the envoy of the Shogun and the Governor of Nagasaki in the European fashion; but he had to consent to leave aside his sword, to take off his shoes before entering the hall of audience and to sit on the floor with his feet stretched out sideways, as he could not be allowed the use of a chair.

The first audience took place on April 4. The Ambassador and five of his officers were conveyed in the Prince of Fisen's state barge from their house at Megasaki to the landing place known as "Ochatto," or the "great stairs," where they were received by a guard of honor and brought from thence, accompanied by a long train of magistrates and soldiers, to the Governor's residence, the Ambassador being carried in a litter, while the others were on foot. Under pretext of showing von Resanoff greater honor, the houses at the landing place and in all the streets through which the procession passed were covered with hangings bearing the imperial arms and those of the Prince of Fisen, so that neither the houses nor the people could be seen. After resting for half an hour, during which pipes and tobacco as well as tea were offered to the Russians, von Resanoff and two of his officers were admitted into the presence of the imperial envoy and the Governor of Nagasaki, who questioned him as to the motives for which he had come to Japan and asked why the Emperor of Russia had taken the liberty of writing to the Shogun, since Lieutenant Laxmann had been informed that it was forbidden by the laws and the customs of the country. They also remarked that though permission had been given to send a trading vessel to Nagasaki, it had never been a question of sending an embassy, and they again demanded for what reasons this permission had not been used for so many years.

Another audience took place on the following day, and at this interview, which was very short, the Ambassador was presented with a roll of paper containing the Shogun's reply to the Emperor's

letter, which was translated for him by the Dutch interpreters. It stated that about 150 years previously the Emperors of Japan had put an end to the free intercourse which had existed until then between Japan and other States, and had forbidden their successors to allow their subjects to leave the country. Only the Chinese and the Dutch were allowed permission to trade with Japan, and every attempt on the part of other nations to share in this privilege had been rejected, as it was considered very dangerous to make friends with unknown foreign powers whose strength might be greater than that of the Empire. The Shogun declined, therefore, to accept the presents sent by the Czar, for if they were accepted it would be necessary to send an Ambassador to offer others in return, which would be contrary to the law, while Japan is so poor that nothing of equal value could be sent. Japan, moreover, had no great wants and suffered from no deficiency of anything. The few foreign wares which had become a necessity from habit were abundantly supplied by the Chinese and the Dutch, and the introduction of luxuries was undesirable. A greater extension of commerce would also cause more intercourse between the people and the foreign sailors, which was strictly prohibited. The Shogun gave orders, however, to supply the ship with provisions for two months, and also that a present of 2,000 sacks of salt of thirty pounds each and a hundred sacks of rice of fifty pounds each should be given to the crew and 2,000 bundles of the finest raw silk to the officers. The Ambassador was obliged to accept these presents much against his will, as the Governor of Nagasaki, who had been ordered to give them, could not have taken them back without referring to Yedo, which would have necessitated a further delay of two months.

No reply could be made to this very decided rejection of the friendly advances of the Czar, which was supplemented by a letter from the Governor of Nagasaki, in which he requested that the Nadeshda on leaving the port should stand out far to sea, as the coast was extremely dangerous; and that in future any Japanese who might be shipwrecked on the Russian shores should be handed over to the Dutch in Europe to be brought back by them to Japan by way of Batavia.

After a third audience for the purpose of taking leave of the envoy of the Shogun and of the Governor of Nagasaki, von Resanoff and the other members of the Russian embassy, who had requested in vain to be allowed to visit the Dutch factory at Deshima and one of the temples in or near Nagasaki, sailed from that port on the morning of April 18, 1805, and reached Petropavlovsk, in Kamtchatka, on June 5. Captain von Krusenstern then surveyed the coasts of Saghalien and left on October 7 for Cronstadt, which he

reached on August 19, 1806, being thus the first Russian sailor who circumnavigated the globe.

On his arrival in Kamtchatka Count von Resanoff, who was the son-in-law of the merchant Schelikoff, the founder of the Russian-American Company, found letters awaiting him from the company requesting him to pay a visit of inspection to its possessions in the Aleutian Islands and on the coast of America. He therefore deferred his return to St. Petersburg and sailed on June 14 for Alaska, together with two lieutenants of the imperial navy, Nicolai Alexandrowitch Chwostoff and Gavrilo Ivanowitch Davidoff, who were then at Petropavlovsk, and whom a few years previously he had induced to enter the company's service while retaining their rank under the imperial government, as an ukase of the Emperor Paul I. authorized them to do. In the course of this voyage von Resanoff, who was naturally much irritated at the ill success of his mission, seems to have formed the plan of effecting a descent upon Japanese territory in order to make the Shogun understand how great was the power of the Czar and how dangerous it was to incur his hostility, hoping that he might thereby constrain him to enter into commercial relations with Russia. The establishment within recent years of some Japanese factories in the Kurile Islands and in the south of the Island of Saghalien, where Russian settlements, which had been long since broken up, had once existed, furnished the Ambassador with a plausible pretext for this aggression. He resolved, therefore, to destroy these colonies, to expel the Japanese, to take under the protection of Russia the inhabitants of the islands, who are Ainos, like the population of Yezo, and by declaring them Russian subjects resassert the claims of the Czar to these territories.

The first allusion to this project is found in a letter which von Resanoff addressed on August 29, 1805, while at Sitka, to Chwostoff and Davidoff, in which he informed them that on account of the high opinion he had formed of their patriotism and of their talents, he had selected them to lead an important expedition, for which in due time he would give them full instructions. He then sent a report on the subject to the Czar and to the Minister of Commerce, Count Romanzoff, in which he represented the advantages which he hoped to derive from this enterprise and praised the zeal and intrepidity of Lieutenant Chwostoff, whom he had chosen to command it. It is, however, a remarkable fact that at an interview which Chwostoff had had in the beginning of 1804 with the same Minister, he was asked whether in case an expedition were to be undertaken requiring great efforts and a daring spirit, he should like to take part in it, to which he replied that its danger would only render it the more agreeable to him. It is therefore possible that

this raid, which is generally supposed to have been planned by von Resanoff out of revenge for the ill success of his mission, may really have been decided upon by the government of the Czar in 1803, before the Ambassador left St. Petersburg, with the object of terrorizing the Japanese in case they should reject the Russian proposals.

Von Resanoff left Sitka in July, 1806, to carry out his project, with two small vessels commanded by Chwostoff and Davidoff—the Juno, of 250 tons, which had been purchased from Captain Wolf, of Bristol, in the State of Rhode Island, who traded with Alaska, and Awos ("Perhaps"), built at Sitka. In a few days, however, he changed his mind and decided on returning to St. Petersburg. He then confided his plan to Chwostoff and gave him instructions for carrying it out, requesting him also to make all concerned in it sign a promise to observe the most profound secrecy, and he sent Davidoff to visit the Kurile Islands and Saghalien, where he was to wait until rejoined by Chwostoff. At the last moment, however, von Resanoff would seem to have felt some doubts as to the legality of the expedition, and to have wished to throw the responsibility of it on his subordinates by leaving it to them to execute it or not, at their discretion. On arriving, therefore, at Okhotsk at the end of September, he requested Chwostoff to give him back his instructions for the purpose, as he said, of amending them, and immediately after having returned to the lieutenant the document thus corrected he left Okhotsk on his way to St. Petersburg, so that it was impossible to question him as to the meaning of the modifications which he had introduced, and which were drawn up in the most ambiguous and contradictory terms. They were to the effect that, as the voyage had been delayed, it was too late for Chwostoff to meet Davidoff at Aniwa Bay, where, too, the fishing season was ended, and that he should therefore disregard the instructions he had previously received and return to America to strengthen the garrison of New Archangel. Nevertheless, if the wind allowed him to put into Aniwa Bay he should examine the situation of the Japanese settlements there and endeavor to win over the natives by distributing presents among them. His chief object, indeed, should be to return to America, but he might find means to reconcile with the interests of the company any unforeseen circumstances which might occur upon the voyage, and his talents and experience would tell him how it would be most advisable to obey this last injunction.

Left, therefore, to find out for himself the meaning of these enigmatical instructions and to decide upon his course of action, Lieutenant Chwostoff came to the conclusion that, though von Resanoff might wish to defer the execution of his project, owing

to the season being so far advanced, he was still resolved that it should be carried out, especially since it had been submitted to the Czar and had not been disapproved of. He therefore sailed for Saghalien, from which Davidoff had been driven away by stormy weather, and landed with a small detachment at Kushunkotan, the principal Japanese settlement, without meeting with any opposition. He then plundered and burnt the magazines, loaded his vessel with rice, tobacco and silken stuffs and distributed to the natives what he could not carry away, giving also to the chief of the villages on the western coast of the Bay of Aniwa the silver medal and ribbon of the Order of St. Vladimir as a sign that the Czar had taken possession of the island, and leaving with him a document to that effect. He then sailed for the harbor of Petropavlovsk, where he met Davidoff and where he passed the winter.

In the spring of the following year, while the ice still surrounded the coast, the two officers cut a passage through it for their ships and set out on May 2 for another piratical expedition, which, however, like that of the preceding year, they may perhaps have looked upon as a vindication of the anterior rights of Russia against Japanese aggressiveness. They landed with about 200 men on Iturup, one of the southern Kurile Islands, where two flourishing colonies of Japanese and Ainos engaged in fishing had been established since about ten years. After plundering and burning Naiho, the smaller of the two settlements, they surprised at night the castle of Shana, where the garrison was stationed, and burned it also, after carrying off much booty and arms of various sorts. The destruction of a third Japanese factory in Saghalien and the capture of some junks ended the campaign, but von Resanoff, who could have accepted the responsibility for the expedition and defended his subordinates, had died in the month of March, of a fall from his horse, in the village of Krasnojarsk, on the Yenissei, while on his way to St. Petersburg, and when Chwostoff and Davidoff reached Okhotsk Captain Bucharin, the commandant of the port, threw them into prison as criminals, under the pretext that they had acted without authority, and seized their ships, which he imagined were laden with immense treasures. At the end of a month, during which they were treated with great inhumanity, they found means to escape, and after long and painful wanderings through woods and marshes they reached Yakutsk. There they were again arrested and detained until released by order of the Minister of Marine, which would seem to indicate that whether the project of invading and devastating some territory belonging to Japan had originated with von Resanoff or with the Russian Minister, it had been accepted and approved of by the Czar.

The casualty which shortly after ended the lives of Chwostoff and Davidoff at the very moment when everything seemed to promise them a brilliant future, was so strange and unexpected that it may perhaps be interesting to relate it, though not a matter immediately connected with the subject of this article. On the breaking out in February, 1808, of the war with Sweden which ended by the conquest of Finland, the two lieutenants reëntered the imperial navy and distinguished themselves by their bravery in the course of the campaign, at the close of which, in September, 1809, they returned to St. Petersburg, where they met again Captain Wolf, from whom they had purchased the Juno, and Dr. von Langsdorf, with whom they had traveled to Alaska. The young officers were returning home one dark night in October after supping with their friends, who accompanied them as far as the bridge of boats over the Neva and saw them cross it; but for some unknown reason a few minutes later they wished to retrace their steps. The bridge being then open, they tried to jump on to a barge passing through, but they alighted on a sail stretched over its side, and, entangled in its folds, they sank into the river and were swept away by its rapid current.

It is not surprising that these unprovoked attacks should have caused considerable alarm and excited a strong feeling of resentment among the Japanese, and that when in the beginning of July, 1811, Captain Vassili Mikhailovitch Golovnin, who had been sent from Kamtchatka in command of the imperial sloop of war Diana to survey the southern Kurile Islands and the coast of Tartary, approached a small fortress at the southern extremity of the Island of Kunashiri, his vessel should have been fired upon. An attempt to land along with a few sailors also drew the fire of the battery upon his boat, but, as he remarks in his "Narrative," the Japanese did not know how to point their guns, and their powder, which made a thick black smoke, was very bad. After a few days, however, Captain Golovnin succeeded in communicating with the Japanese officers and in obtaining supplies of wood and water, while by means of a Kurile interpreter he had with him named Alexei he sought to persuade them that the Russian Government was not responsible for the piratical enterprises of Chwostoff and Davidoff, and had duly punished them for their misdeeds. But, as the interpreter informed him, the approach of the sloop had filled the Japanese with consternation, and the sight of a Russian inspired them with terror, for they had been astonished at the rapidity of the Russian fire and the excellent order in which they had fought in the attack made on their settlements. It was, therefore, probably as a precaution against another surprise, if not as retaliation for the

past, that the Governor of the fort, after inviting Captain Golovnin to a conference and treating him hospitably, suddenly threw off the mask and seized him along with two other officers, four of his sailors and the interpreter.

The prisoners were immediately bound after the Japanese fashion, first with thick cords and then with smaller ones, tied with a combination of loops and knots so cunningly devised that on the slightest attempt to escape they could be drawn still more tightly so as to produce intense pain or even strangulation. Some time later it was explained to the Russians that the object of this rigorous treatment, to which even the most distinguished Japanese officers were subjected when arrested, and even before being proved to be guilty, was to render it impossible for them to commit suicide, which, according to Japanese ideas, they might be driven to do from despair at the misfortune which had befallen them. On the following day Captain Golovnin and his companions were brought over to the Island of Yezo. They traveled in boats along its coast for some days, and then by land, walking or carried in litters, but still tightly bound, till on July 17, in the town of Akeshi, their bonds were removed for a short time and the wounds caused by their pressure were bandaged. Two days later a richly dressed private of the Shogun's guard, whose position gave him a rank superior to that of the retainers of a Daimio, took the command of the escort, which was composed of soldiers belonging to the army of the Prince of Nambu, and ordered the hands of the prisoners to be left unbound. They then continued their journey towards Hakodate, at the southern extremity of the island, which they entered on August 8 with great ceremony, the soldiers of the escort putting on their helmets and coats of mail for the occasion.

With the exception of this cruel system of binding the limbs of their prisoners as one of the precautions against suicide decreed by the laws, which extended even to fixing wooden balls to the mouthpieces of their pipes, lest they should try to swallow them, the conduct of the Japanese towards Captain Golovnin and his companions was uniformly humane and courteous. They were given three meals a day, consisting generally of boiled rice, pickled radishes, broth made of radishes and broiled fish. On arriving at their lodgings in the evening their feet were bathed with warm water, and the crowds which assembled in every village to witness their arrival or their departure never offered them the slightest insult or showed any signs of hatred, but frequently asked to be allowed to give them fruit and other delicacies. The Japanese also took great pleasure in having sketches of ships, or Russian names, or anything in the Russian language inscribed upon their fans by

the prisoners, to be preserved as great curiosities, and never, indeed, at any time did they manifest that antipathy to foreigners which is so characteristic of other Orientals, but seemed as if they would willingly have entertained friendly relations with the outer world if it were not for the jealous prohibition of their rulers.

On reaching Hakodate the Russians were brought to a large gloomy building resembling a barn, surrounded by a fence crowned with a *cheval-de-frize*, outside which ran a low wall of earth hung with striped cloth. Within it was divided into several apartments about six feet square and eight feet high formed of strong spars and resembling bird cages. That in which Captain Golovnin was confined had two windows closed with gratings, one of which commanded a view of the Straits of Tsugar and of the neighboring hills; but those in which his companions were placed were smaller and almost without light. The only furniture was a bench and a few mats and cushions. Before long, however, these cages were enlarged by the suppression of the partitions, and the Russians were allowed to converse together. They were visited every day by officers of the Governor of Hakodate, accompanied by a physician named Togo, and they were frequently brought before the Governor to be examined by him. At these interviews they were very minutely questioned as to their names and ages, the places of their birth, their rank in the navy, how many men they commanded and the number of guns on board their ship. A very singular question was suggested by the change in the mode of dressing the hair which had taken place since some years, for Laxmann had worn his hair powdered and tied in a long pig-tail, while Captain Golovnin and his companions wore theirs unpowdered and cut short. The Governor, therefore, asked if there had not been a change of religion in Russia, and was much surprised to learn that in Europe there was no connection between religion and the fashion in which the hair was worn, nor any law on the subject. The answers to all these questions were carefully written down, the greatest precision in the translation was insisted on, and as the Kurile interpreter was not very well acquainted with either Russian or Japanese the examination generally lasted for several hours.

The anxiety of the Russians as to the fate which might be awarded them may well be imagined, for they knew that the law of Japan condemned whoever landed on the shores of the Empire to imprisonment for life, and by the questions put to them they perceived that they were suspected of having participated in the piratical expeditions of Chwostoff and Davidoff. To whatever was asked on that matter Captain Golovnin, who was most probably not aware that a report on the subject had been sent to the Czar, could only

reply that those officers had acted without authorization; that they commanded mercantile vessels, and that their crews were not in the service of the State. Moreover, on returning to Okhotsk they had been thrown into prison and their ships had been seized by the commandant of the port.

The Japanese officials, it is true, did not seem to be fully convinced by these answers, and the Russians were much alarmed and embarrassed on being shown the paper which Chwostoff had given to the chief of Aniwa Bay, in which he took the title of lieutenant of the Russian fleet and commander of the frigate Juno.

This compromising document rendered it still more difficult for Captain Golovnin to persuade the Governor that the Juno was really a merchant vessel, and that Chwostoff had acted on his own responsibility, but he does not fail to remark in his "Narrative" that the Japanese always questioned him with the greatest courtesy, laughing good humoredly and seeking to make the examination resemble a conversation between friends rather than a formal inquiry.

At the end of September the Russians were transferred to Matsumai, the capital of the island, where their prison, like that of Hakodate, consisted of two cages. That in which the officers were placed was six paces square and ten feet high; the other, where were the four sailors and Alexei, the interpreter, was of equal breadth and height, but two paces longer. Outside was a guard room, where two soldiers of the Shogun's army were always on duty, and beyond the fence which surrounded the building was an outer guard furnished by the soldiers of the Prince of Tsugar.

At Matsumai the Bunyo or Viceroy of the Island of Yezo, whose jurisdiction extended also over the Kurile Islands and Saghalien, examined the Russians frequently, and his questions were still more incoherent and irrelevant than those asked at Hakodate. Such inquries as "What kind of dress does the Emperor of Russia wear?" "What kinds of birds are found near St. Petersburg?" "How many guns are placed round the imperial palace?" "In what way do the Russians eat their food?" "What are the dimensions of the imperial palace, and what is the number of its windows?"—to quote only a few from the long list given in the "Narrative"—irritated the Russians, who were anxious to obtain their liberty with as little delay as possible, and they often refused to reply. The Bunyo, who was invariably extremely courteous towards his prisoners, would then apologize and protest that he merely questioned them as a friend, and these scenes sometimes recurred three or four times in the course of the same interview.

As the winter approached the Japanese sought to alleviate as

much as possible the hardships of prison life for Captain Golovnin and his companions. They provided them with warm clothing and furs, gave them benches to sleep on and built fireplaces close to each cage, in which they kept up charcoal fires both day and night. Towards the end of December, by the removal of the bars which separated each cell, their prison was changed into a large hall, the floor of which was covered with mats, and in March they were allowed to walk about the town and its environs accompanied by some soldiers, an interpreter and servants, who carried their dinner. In April they were at last removed from the prison to a large and comfortable house provided with a garden, but where they were still closely guarded by the soldiers of the Shogun and of the Prince of Tsugar. Here they found themselves in more favorable circumstances for executing the project they had long entertained of attempting to escape; for they were exasperated at the slowness with which the deliberations regarding their fate were carried on at the court of the Shogun and the uncertainty of the result. At Yedo, indeed, as they were informed, there was a general conviction, even among the people, that Lieutenant Chwostoff had made his descent on the Japanese settlements by order of the Czar, and that Captain Golovnin had come to inspect their harbors as the forerunner of a still more formidable expedition. Despairing, therefore, of being ever set free, the Russians decided that they would prefer to perish in attempting to escape rather than remain in Japan, and they discussed the possibility of surprising and disarming their guards at night, when they would make for the seashore, where they hoped to seize some vessel in which they could gain the coast of Kamtchatka or of Tartary. They began, therefore, to make preparations for their flight. They laid by every day a portion of their rice; they concealed a chisel and a spade which had been forgotten in their garden; they procured tinder by burning some linen, and to make a compass they magnetized a needle by rubbing it on a stone, and made a case for it out of a few sheets of paper fastened together with rice. The watchfulness of their guards was not the only danger against which they had to take precautions, but also, strange to say, the hostility of one of their number, the midshipman Moore, who was, indeed, born in Russia, but who, as his father was German, sought to dissociate himself from his comrades and threatened to denounce their plans to the Japanese, in whose service he hoped to enter as European interpreter.

Captain Golovnin and his companions, with the exception of Moore and the interpreter Alexei, were at last able to execute their project at midnight on April 23, after their guards had performed

their usual round of inspection. A hole was then quickly dug under the fence surrounding the house; they crept through it, and after crossing a neighboring cemetery and some open fields they climbed the hills lying to the north of the town, a journey of three days through which, according to their calculations, would bring them to the western coast of the island. For several days they made their way through the mountains, which in many places were still covered with snow, traveling usually only at night and hiding by day in the woods, where they were able to light a fire and cook their provisions. They frequently approached the shore, along which lay numerous villages, but some of the boats they found there were too small, while others had been dragged so high on the beach that they were unable to launch them. After undergoing very great hardships in the course of their wanderings, they were surrounded on May 2 by soldiers, who had followed their traces, and brought back to Matsumai with their hands tied behind them, but not so cruelly as on the previous occasion, and neither their guards nor the crowds which assembled to look at them as they passed through the villages offered them any insult or treated them with derision, but seemed rather to commiserate their misfortune.

On their return to Matsumai the Bunyo received them with his usual courtesy and without expressing any anger or displeasure he questioned them as to the motives of their flight and showed them how hopeless had been their attempt; but he assured them that as they were foreigners and therefore ignorant of the laws of the country, his good opinion of them would remain unaltered. They were then led to one of the ordinary prisons for criminals, where the cages were somewhat smaller than those in which they had been first confined; but it was, nevertheless, as Captain Golovnin remarks, much superior to most European prisons of that epoch, for it was scrupulously clean and was swept out every day. The Russians remained here till the beginning of July, when they were transferred to the place in which they had been first confined on their arrival in Matsumai; and as they were now allowed the use of writing materials they began to compose a Japanese vocabulary, but they were obliged to use Russian characters, for the laws of Japan did not allow Christians to be taught to read or to write the language, and Kumadschero, the Bunyo's interpreter, could not obtain permission to teach them the Japanese alphabet.

In the meantime every effort was being made to rescue the prisoners which was possible in such a remote locality and under the difficult circumstances in which the Russian Government was at that time situated. The news of the seizure of Captain Golovnin had been brought to Okhotsk by Lieutenant Rikord, who had suc-

ceeded to the command of the sloop Diana, and who, after exchanging some shots with the Japanese batteries, soon perceived that it would be useless to attempt to storm the castle with the small force of fifty-one officers and men at his disposal. The lieutenant forwarded his report to St. Petersburg, together with a request that an expedition might be fitted out for the purpose of delivering the prisoners, but the Russian Empire was at that moment at war with Turkey, and was drifting into the war with France which had as its result the invasion of Russia, and the Emperor Alexander could only direct Lieutenant Rikord to return to Kunashiri and ascertain the fate of the imprisoned Russians.

The lieutenant set sail on July 22, 1812, and did not arrive at Kunashiri till August 28. He had with him six Japanese who had been wrecked on the coast of Kamtchatka in the previous year and one of those who had been carried off by Chwostoff and who could serve as interpreter. At Kunashiri Lieutenant Rikord tried to communicate with the commandant of the fort, but after waiting several days the only reply he received to his letters was a verbal message from that officer that he might hold an interview with him in the town, an invitation which it would have been imprudent to accept, and when the interpreter was sent on shore to inquire what had become of Captain Golovnin and his companions, the answer he brought back was "they are all dead." Anxious, however, to obtain more certain information, Lieutenant Rikord a few days later captured a large Japanese ship which was commanded by its owner, a wealthy merchant named Tachatai Kachi. From him he learned that the prisoners were then living at Matsumai, and hoping that through his intervention he might acquire some knowledge of the views of the Japanese Government towards them, he brought him away to Kamtchatka, together with four of his sailors. The kind treatment which Tachatai Kachi experienced during his stay at Petropavlovsk, where he soon learned to converse in Russian, made a favorable impression on him, and he expressed a desire to see the differences between the two Empires speedily adjusted; he also stated that when von Resanoff's mission came to Nagasaki the Japanese had hoped that a commercial treaty would be concluded with Russia, and that they were displeased with their government when it dismissed the Ambassador without granting him an interview.

Lieutenant Rikord returned to Kunashiri with Tachatai Kachi in the month of June following. An imprudent threat on his part that in case he received no information about his countrymen within three days he would bring his prisoner back to Okhotsk and return with armed vessels to demand their liberation nearly drove the

Japanese merchant to commit suicide. He had already made preparations for it by cutting from the crown of his head the central tuft of hair, which he placed in a box together with his portrait and gave to one of the sailors to be brought to his wife, as well as his sword to be presented to his son, as a sign that he died an honorable death, and his family would then have buried his hair with all the ceremonies observed at an interment. A timely change in Lieutenant Rikord's plans luckily saved Tachatai's life; but he very frankly confessed that before killing himself he would have killed the lieutenant and his first officer, a deed which would have caused his memory to be cherished with respect and conferred great honor on his descendants.

Tachatai was therefore allowed to land for the purpose of negotiating with the commander of the fortress, and after a few days Takahassi Sampei, the first counsellor of the Viceroy of Yezo, arrived from Matsumai in a ship decorated with flags and bearing on her sails the red disk which was the imperial emblem. He brought a request from the Japanese Government to be furnished with an attestation signed by two Russian commanders of districts that Chwostoff had made his piratical descents on the Kurile Islands and Saghalien without the knowledge and consent of the Russian Government, and also that the arms which had been carried off might be restored, or at least an assurance given that they were no longer to be found in Okhotsk.

Lieutenant Rikord sailed immediately for the Siberian port and returned from it to Hakodate on September 27, bringing the document demanded by the Japanese Government with the signatures of the Governor of Irkutsk and of the commander of Okhotsk. During his stay in the harbor of Hakodate, while waiting for an answer, the laws which prohibited any intercourse with Europeans were rigorously enforced. The Russians were forbidden to sail about the harbor; a guard boat was stationed near their ship by night and by day, and though the government furnished them with all they needed, no one, with the exception of Tachatai and some officers, was allowed to visit them until the day of their departure. As a curious example of the usages of old Japan, it may be mentioned that Tachatai Kachi on returning to his country learned that his wife, overcome with grief at his capture, had undertaken a pilgrimage to the most celebrated shrines of Japan, and that for the same reason one of his friends had distributed all his wealth to the poor and retired to the mountains to live as a hermit.

The letter from the Governor of Irkutsk was presented to the officers sent by the Viceroy of Matsumai in a solemn audience, to which Lieutenant Rikord was conveyed in the Governor's state

barge, accompanied as a special favor by ten marines under arms, and he was soon after allowed to have an interview with Captain Golovnin and the other prisoners. The translation of the Russian documents into Japanese and the preparation of the answers occupied some days, but on October 7 Captain Golovnin and his companions were at length set free after a detention of two years and three months, and on the 10th the Diana sailed for Petropavlovsk, which she reached on November 3, 1813.

It may perhaps be interesting to conclude this article by quoting the opinion of the Japanese which Captain Golovnin, who studied them attentively, has expressed in his "Recollections of Japan," and his forecast of the degree of power to which they might attain if they were ever constrained to revoke the laws which isolated them from the world and to adopt European institutions:

"The Japanese Government will have the people satisfied with the degree of knowledge they possess and to make use of the productions of their own country, and forbids them to adopt anything foreign, lest foreign manners should creep in with foreign arts and sciences. Their neighbors must thank Providence for having inspired the Japanese law-givers with this thought, and should endeavor to give them no inducement to change this policy for that of Europe. What must we expect if this numerous, ingenious and industrious people, who are capable of everything and much inclined to imitate all that is foreign, should ever have a sovereign like our Peter the Great? With the resources and treasures which Japan possesses he would enable it to become in a few years the ruler of the Eastern Ocean. What would then become of the maritime provinces of Eastern Asia and the settlements on the west coast of America, which are so remote from the countries by which they must be protected? If the Japanese should think fit to introduce the science of Europe, and adopt our policy as a model, we should then see the Chinese obliged to do the same; in that case these two powerful nations might soon transform the state of Europe. However deeply a horror of everything foreign may be impressed on the Japanese and Chinese Governments, yet a change in their system is not inconceivable; necessity may compel them to do that to which their own free will does not impel them. Attacks, for example, like that of Chwostoff often repeated would probably induce them to think of means to repel a handful of vagabonds who disturbed a nation. This might lead them to build ships of war on the model of those of Europe; these ships might increase to fleets, and then it is probable that the success of the measure would lead them to adopt the other scientific methods which are applicable to the destruction of the human race. In

this manner all the inventions of Europe might gradually take root in Japan, even without the creative spirit of a Peter, merely by the power and concurrence of circumstances. The Japanese certainly would not be in want of teachers if they would only invite them. I therefore believe that this just and upright people must by no means be provoked."

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, Eng.

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN THE MEDIÆVAL GUILDS.

IT HAS been said by a keen, scholarly critic that the cheerful optimism of the American people often blinds them to social evils that day by day wax strong under the very eyes of statesmen and legislators, much to the danger of our national peace and security. That this contains at least a measure of truth was well proved on the occasion of our last national elections. Statistics of votes revealed to many an incredulous eye the startling fact that socialism, a sure sign of unrest and discontent, had suddenly, as if by magic, become a power in politics. A great many of our citizens blinked their eyes and caught their breath and for a while refused to be convinced. But facts are stubborn and will in the event displace sentiment and make room for a fairer play of reason. So at least it happened in the present case, and then forthwith "dire portent and prophecy" went abroad. Our conservative fathers shook their venerable heads in token of serious misgivings, whilst the young in their own thoughtless way wondered whither away the nation. And yet had these men taken more serious thought on our social conditions, no optimism, cheerful or otherwise, would have closed their eyes to the real state of affairs. Dense, widespread smoke argues an extensive fire. Frequent lawless disturbances bespeak deeper and more serious social ills. For years past there have swept over the country periodic waves of violence that was regardless of human life, defiant of law and authority and destructive of trade. For instance, in 1886 strikes and lockouts, violent and mild, totaled 9,861; thereafter they wavered like uncertain fever curves, until at last, in 1890, they jumped to the maximum again and seriously menaced public security. In many respects the aspect of still later days is a bit more gloomy. An able summary in a recent issue of the

Catholic Fortnightly Review[1] so presents the situation that even "he who runs may read:" "For two years and a half . . . deaths from violence incident to strikes were four-fifths as many as in the two days' fighting at El Caney and San Juan, while the injuries were actually one-third more numerous. There were in all 180 deaths, 1,651 injuries and 5,533 arrests. . . . A further analysis establishes the fact, which hardly needs statistical proof, that the deaths and injuries are chiefly inflicted on non-union men, while most of the arrests are of union strikers. Of the 180 killed 116 were non-union men, 51 union strikers and 13 officers. Of the 1,651 injured 1,366 were non-union men, 151 union strikers and 134 officers. On the other hand, of the 5,333 arrests 5,159, or nearly four-fifths, were of union men. These figures need no comment; they show that at times an evil leaven ferments to excess the susceptible spirit of our workmen. In critical moment, and perhaps in others, too, the trade unions betray a surly, socialistic temper that discredits them in the public mind and undoes much of the good work which they have so laboriously accomplished.

To law makers and economists this is no doubt annoying; to us it should prove interesting, in that it furnishes occasion for a study of other workmen, and especially of other unions which were so deeply permeated with a religious spirit that they proved an almost universal blessing to employer and employe, to Church and State alike. Such were the guilds of the much maligned Middle Ages, unions in name and fact, with a sublime mission for good to craftsmen and tradesmen of all ages and conditions.

When these societies first came into vogue it is hard to say. Tertullian is witness for the fact that some such unions had place amongst the early Christians. Two centuries later frequent and clear reference is made to a society of goldsmiths, and thereafter there is no obscurity. Dagobert I. in the seventh century issued an edict that concerned a bakers' guild; the first holy Roman Empire boasted its corporations of artisans; the annals of Ravenna witness a fisherman's union as early as 943 A. D., which brings us to the beginning of the period with which our remarks are chiefly concerned.[2] In final aim, not, however, in method, these guilds were much the same as our modern union; in structure they differed, in that they included not only the employes, but also the employers. The one and the other lived together under approved rules which, though severe in their Christian simplicity, were insisted on with an exactness that is little short of marvelous. This will surprise us the more when we consider that the observance of

[1] Summarizing from the *Outlook*.

[2] German craft guilds belong to a somewhat later period.

these regulations called for the practice of an exalted virtue that is almost unknown to-day, even amongst our most upright American workers. Mediæval craft and tradesmen evidently grasped to the full the significance of these words of one of their favorite manuals: "Let us," it reads, "work according to God's laws, else shall our labor be without blessing and bring evil on our souls. Men should work for the honor of God. . . . He who, acting otherwise, seeks only pecuniary recompense of his work, does ill and his labors are but usury."[3] Or, again, as it is written elsewhere: "The master must take the apprentice to church and with zeal bring him up in honesty and the fear of God. . . . He (the apprentice) must, morning and evening, during his work, beg God's help and protection, for without God he can do nothing. . . . Every Sunday and holyday he must hear mass and a sermon and read good books. He must be industrious and seek not his own glory, but God's."[4] Herein was the secret of the guild's power. The sweet spirit of Christ was abroad on the earth, all pervading and deep enough to leaven the hearts of the crudest toiler. Cooks and butchers, brewers and fruit venders, tailors, masons, painters and shoemakers, bakers, dyers, barbers and carpenters, everybody who earned his bread in the sweat of his brow had learned the true lesson of life and was anxious to enroll himself in a guild which would see to it that his stay on earth was sweetened as best it might by virtue and prosperity.

There was no neglect, no inactivity. Over each guild there presided a warden or syndic whose constant care it was to preserve the honor and dignity of his society. Elected by his fellows or appointed as might be by a King or feudal lord, he felt the importance and responsibility of his position. As a consequence, his eye was ever alert for abuses which, as we shall see, were met with most drastic remedies. Day after day he made his tour of inspection to see that no rule, however slight, was disregarded.

But the guild's care of the virtue and fair name of its members did not begin with this precaution. For from the beginning it exercised a most careful vigilance over all candidates. The very first conditions for admission were legitimate birth and a spotless reputation. He who lacked unimpeachable testimony on these scores applied in vain for enrollment. These assured, the young man after due instruction in his duties and obligations, was led to a church or shrine by two sponsors, and there before an altar or favorite statue most solemnly assumed the obligations of his state. Then forthwith, while the

[3] Janssen, Vol. II., p. 9.
[4] Janssen, Vol. II., p. 20.

spell of religion was still fresh upon him, he was inducted with much ceremony into the presence of the Mayor or other official and in turn taken to the house of his master. Here, at one period at least, he found an honorable place amongst the children of the household. This was no mere "boarding out system." Under pain of most severe penalties the master was obliged to look sharp to the spiritual and bodily welfare of his charge. He was to maintain him in comfort and upbring him in the fear of God and love of work. And woe to him were he caught overtaxing the boy's strength or prolonging his hours of labor or setting him a task that prevented his attendance at Mass on days of obligation. As a consequence of all these precautions the master usually proved a sincere, tender foster-father. In accordance with his rule he was watchful of the boy's morals, shielding him by quaint means from love of prowling by night and gambling and excessive drink. Moreover, in his own conduct the master was scrupulously careful to set an example of purity and uprightness that was sure to have effect upon a susceptible heart. He had before his mind this ennobling thought contained in one of the rules of the stone-cutters' guild: "If, according to the Christian dispensation, all are bound to seek the salvation of their souls, how much more so are those masters and workers whom God has graciously endowed with talents. . . . If they possess Christian hearts, they should be filled with gratitude and work for the glory of God and the salvation of their own souls."[5] Now this was not hollow cant. It was at once a rule of life and an expression of an almost universal conviction which saw fulfillment in daily work. These men of the days of faith were wise with the wisdom of their Father and gave force to their wisdom in the rules of the guilds. In keeping with their precepts they observed faithfully and joyfully fast and feast. Moreover, no consideration of profit or desire of pleasing dissenting neighbors was taken as a justification for "open shop" on a forbidden day. Indeed, in many guilds so strict were the rules about religious duty that play at dice or cards on the eve of those feasts, which were celebrated with special pomp and ceremony, was forbidden under pain of a year's suspension. Games, it was argued, meant late hours and late hours were apt to induce neglect of a sacred duty on the morrow. The consequence of all this can easily be inferred. There were few complaints about empty pews, skipping of sermons and prolonged absence from confession. The guildsman's rules obviated these modern difficulties. No mere whim could keep him from Mass or confession or monthly attendance at the special service in the guild church or chapel. All these

[5] Janssen, Vol. II., p. 10.

were of precept, and that was sufficient for him. Perhaps the guildsman's religious enthusiasm, so simple and spontaneous ever in those phlegmatic by nature, found its fullest expression on the patronal feast of his society. At an early hour he was at the guild house, where he met his happy, cheery companions who had gathered together from all sides. When all was in readiness off they went to the church, column after column in grand array, catching inspiration from brilliant banners, emblazoned with pictures of their patron saints, who had been chosen for this office because they had sanctified themselves at their trades or crafts and would in turn guide their client guildmen in the way of light and truth. In the church all assisted at a Solemn Mass, and while they were thus engaged within, the poor without were enjoying a substantial dinner at the guild's expense. But perchance this may smack of sentiment. Some skeptic may ask for stronger proof of the religious spirit of these guilds.

If his standard of judgment be: "By their fruits ye shall know them," he will find strong argument in a still broader charity that always characterized these unions. Amongst themselves the members were as brothers, soul knit to soul. A master guildman's home was the whole world. Wherever he went he was welcomed with open arms and a warm heart. Differences of race and language did not interfere with the exercise of tender charity; the traveler was welcomed to the hearth of his fellows, to be cheered by the same joy and peace that obtained at his home in a far distant land. Nor was this fine sense of fellowship reserved for members alone. The needy of every age and condition felt its spell. The saddened lives of widows and orphans were brightened by it. Dowerless maidens had reason to be thankful for it. It reached out to slaves in far-away lands and broke the gyves that fettered body and soul.[6] It found expression in the establishment of schools for the conversion of pagans and infidels. In France, Spain, England, Germany and Italy it erected and adorned churches and built and maintained hospitals. We read in an ancient chronicle, for example, that at one time France was dotted with exquisite shrines wrought of gold and silver, the generous gift of the guilds. Gothic cathedrals, too, and storied stained-glass windows and delicate screens and marvelous bronze gates all tell the same story of whole-souled charity. But no doubt the sweetness and tenderness of the guild's charity is shown to the best advantage by their care

[6] Digby, in "Ages of Faith," Vol. I., bk. 2, p. 212, records that in the year 1830 it was stated in London that the ironmongers' fraternity were then in possession of £104,000, and of £3,000 per annum, accumulated in their hands from ancient donations which had been destined for the redemption of Christian slaves on the Barbary coast.

of the sick. Almost every union maintained its own hospital, where the suffering members of Christ's body were nursed with a tenderness and consideration that appealed to every heart. Luther, for instance, during his visit to Rome bore glowing testimony to the perfection of the Italian hospitals, a fact which is the more surprising in view of the circumstance that for years his own land was justly famous for its guild infirmaries and hospitals.[7]

The guilds' consideration for the minor comforts of the poor is well illustrated by the fact that in many places, especially in Germany, they spent large sums of money in the erection of bath houses, which were open to the use of all. Sometimes, it is true, a small fee was exacted for the bath. This, however, was quite exceptional, and in those places in which the custom was in vogue many of the unions had a special fund for bath money, on which every apprentice might draw as he willed. Moreover, guildmen not infrequently left legacies for the foundation of bath houses, wherein wine and biscuit were distributed to the poor after the bath. And we read—how strange it sounds!—that in one city every poor person who bathed on Saturday received a small sum of money, perhaps by way of reward and encouragement. Janssen in his history of the German guilds tells us that at least once a year the guildmen of a certain town were accustomed to don white robes and march to the bath houses to the music of the fife and drum.[8] This may move a smile; and indeed at first blush it is suggestive of an unseemly prank of college boys whose inflammable enthusiasms have been fired in some mysterious way by an athletic victory over an old rival. However, quaint though this may be, it might teach a salutary lesson sadly needed in our day, when, according to the statement of a trustworthy journal, seventy-five per cent. of the public school children of one of our large Eastern cities are unwashed and fifty per cent. pediculous. All this care of the guilds about bathing does not surprise us when we understand that they considered cleanliness of body an aid to virtue. "Possess your souls in strength and purity, no less preserve your bodies strong and pure; thereto use what precautions your leisure will permit, also bathing and the like. . . . And they must use the money (bath money) well, for every laborer, whatever be his age, must keep himself clean in body, which cleanliness also ministers to the soul's good."[9] So runs the instruction to the mediæval workmen. What has been said so far, no doubt, points to a very high standard of virtue amongst the older tradesmen and craftsmen.

[7] Pastor, Vol. V., p. 65.
[8] This custom was most probably intended to furnish amusement.
[9] Janssen, Vol. II., pp. 33, 34.

However, there is yet to be considered another virtue which puts their character beyond the reach of imputation—their probity. This is in so striking a constrast with the chicanery and trickery of modern times that a few words on the subject may prove interesting and instructive. From the very beginning of their career no effort was spared to impress craftsmen and tradesmen with the dignity and beauty of honesty. The craft apprentice on his induction into the ranks of the journeymen solemnly pledged his honor before God to do sound honest work, and even apart from moral considerations he realized that it was to his advantage to bend every effort to the fulfillment of his vow. For he knew full well that the acquisition of the mastership depended on the execution of work which should be adjudged masterly by the best critics of the craft. Moreover, his shop and his work was subject at all times to the inspection of the guild wardens and municipal officers, who destroyed with unsparing hand everything that betokened careless or dishonest workmanship. Punishments for fraud were most severe; there were fines and expulsions and immersions in muddy pools.[10] Tradesmen, too, were kept rigorously in the narrow path. Nowadays adulteration of goods causes no surprise. It seems to be the rule rather than the exception. The wine of the rich, the food of the poor, the most necessary medicines are all subject to it. In other times this would have been a most perilous venture, for a merchant who was caught in this fraud was frequently treated as a robber and put to death.[11]

There yet remains for brief consideration two important fields in which the guilds exerted a vast influence for good, either directly or indirectly. It may seem strange to us to hear that simple, busy work-a-day men were strongly instrumental in building up the religious art and literature of the Middle Ages. But truth is often stranger than fiction. These guilds and societies that grew up within them or beside them were responsible for a vast deal of the art and literature that to-day is the marvel of travelers and students.

As we have seen, each society possessed its own church or chapel, a special object of care and veneration on the part of the members. Each guild vied with other to make its church the most beautiful in the land. Skilful guildmen threw their whole souls into the fashioning of stately façades or chaste marble altars or delicately carved screens or ivory crucifixes or jeweled vestments for their own beloved church. The best artists of the period were employed

[10] In connection with penalties, it is interesting and consoling to note that the guilds had systematic punishments for breaches against purity. Indeed, so high was their regard for the angelic virtue that even indelicate remarks were punished by fines.

[11] Parsons, "Studies in Church History," Vol. VI., p. 543.

to decorate. In Italy, for instance, Bellini and Carpaccio and del Sarto lent their brushes to the cause, with the result that to-day many a museum of Europe is embellished with soul-inspiring works of art that originally adorned guild churches and chapels.

Of the guilds' influence in creating an ennobling literature much might be written. Long before the dawn of the Middle Ages they began to give encouragement to literary effort. Later in the days of William the Conqueror a yearly prize was offered for the best poem in honor of the Blessed Virgin. At first these literary efforts were purely lyrical; but gradually the writers caught inspiration from the beautifully dramatic ritual of the Church, with the result that their productions soon took on the character of dramas, which as early as the thirteenth century were presented with all the dignity and gorgeousness that devotion, talent and money could provide. It is wonderful how important a part these dramas came to play in the lives of the people. So popular did they become that the best litterateurs of the day bent their strongest efforts to produce a worthy miracle or mystery or morality play. The subjects for the play were drawn from the dogmas of the Church or the lives of the saints. In the beginning the plays were given in the church, but as they grew more elaborate they were removed to the open, where they were carried out on a scale of magnificence which is almost beyond belief. Renowned artists, for instance, Brunellisco, worked laboriously day in and day out to paint fitting scenery. There were marvelous light effects, too, and strange mechanism which puzzle a modern reader and tell of an ingenuity that is striking. The day chosen for the play was generally the feast day of the guild. On that day it was never gloomy by nature; such was reserved for days of penance. The festal Mass and banquet over, a merry throng gathered for the drama, which for tenderness of feeling and dignity of sentiment could hardly be surpassed. Its effects can readily be estimated by those who have seen or read "Every-Man."

In very truth these plays served the true purpose of the drama in arousing the better passion, a purpose which even the most cultured frequenters of our modern theatre would scarcely think of attaching to any plays had they not perchance read in their books of rhetoric that such is the legitimate end of the stage.

These are some of the many ways in which the Christian spirit of the guilds found picturesque expression in the lives of the people, and though the unions themselves were long since swept away by a destructive tide of neo-paganism, yet the memory of them is preserved in sweet odor. Christ's spirit towards toilers was especially deep in their souls, a temper of which our country has sore need. For protest as we may to the contrary, the condition of our work-

men is far from satisfactory. The merry song that of yore was wont to accompany the click of the tools has given way to hoarse murmurs of discontent. Wrongs are numerous and serious and call for more consideration than that shown by a shrug of the shoulders and a smart remark to the effect that the world is simply listening to the story of Dives and Lazarus once again. For be it remembered that Dives is no longer Dives and Lazarus is no longer Lazarus. The former, perchance, is as well groomed, polished, sensual, inconsiderate as ever. But over and above all this his power and the evil effects thereof are greater than ever before. And Lazarus, has he not changed? Sore afflicted he is, as from the beginning; but at this hour he lies at no man's gate, not even at his sovereign's. He no longer abides his trials in patience; Job has ceased to be his patron. He feels the power that lies in organization, and is quickly availing himself of it. The ballot is in his hand; and in its use he is largely directed by leaders who are stern fanatics in the light and wily designers under cover, men who respect no religion nor man nor God. In countries once more set in traditions and form of government than ours they have long since swung "the hewers of wood and drawers of water" into serried ranks, with the ballot as a weapon. France and Italy can tell what they accomplished, and if "Anglo-Saxon" pride persists in scorning "inferior races," what say we of their progress in Germany, Teutonic almost to the core? Scorn that, too?

It were better not to stultify ourselves. A problem presses for solution. "Frenzied finance" on the one hand and deep unrest and dissatisfaction and a grim determination to right wrongs on the other are facts that must be met. To this end two ways have been proposed; the one, the way of the head, *knowledge;* the other, the way of the head and the heart, *knowledge and religion.* As far back as 1890 Professor Marshall told a distinguished English audience that more knowledge was needed to escape on the one side the cruelty and waste of irresponsible competition and the licentious use of wealth, and the tyranny and spiritual death of an iron-bound socialism on the other. Since then day by day knowledge has grown apace. Political economy in all its branches has been reduced to quite an exact science. So great, too, has been its prominence and so minute its details that every year a comparatively new literature owes to it its origin. Newspaper and magazine and pamphlet and novel and pulpit and stage and university hall and public platform and drawing room and street corner have discussed it with the lofty air of superlative knowledge. It is on the lips of all, as well the aristocrat as the man in the street. Ways and means of relief are proposed and tried, appropriations made,

commissions appointed. Even fine ladies have taken up sociology and gone a-slumming. There are mothers' meetings and maidens' meetings, in which some grand dame, whose frequent and prolonged absence from home has reduced her acquaintance with her own children to a mere bowing formality, tells how a family should be upbrought, how many children can be supported on a slender stipend, how best to ventilate the house, how that babies sleep best lying on their stomachs, etc., etc. And yet what is the outcome of all, relief for the workman? Not a whit. Trials are still manifold and insistent. Mere knowledge cannot of its nature cure social ills. Political economy, ethical though it be and strong on its foundation in the natural law, lacks to a vast extent the higher saving spirit of Christ, the one thing necessary above all others. For when passions run high they are apt by the very force of impact to wreck the barrier of the mere natural law. Then revealed religion alone can stem the tide, not bare, cold political economy, which well merits Cardinal Manning's caustic description of "a dismal science of supply and demand, wage funds and labor markets." Knowledge has failed of this mission and will continue to fail until religion goes hand in hand with it, as was its wont.

Years ago a dear "white shepherd of Christendom"—God bless his name—realized this to the full and wrote it large in his encyclical on "The Condition of Labor." And he above all men knew whereof he spoke. For many a long weary year, instinct with the spirit of Christ, he had stood alone on the watch tower of his Master's vineyard, with ear attuned to every moan of despair and wail of distress that came up from hillside and valley below. Secluded from the world he yet felt its pulse, and wisely and tenderly did he prescribe for its ills, pleading with employer and employe alike to seek relief from their troubles by the second method, the way of the head and the heart through knowledge and religion. He would have all put on the spirit of Christ as the sovereign remedy of their ills. Then he would call back from the storied ages the old guilds and gather his reborn children into them, where they would be nourished with the bread of justice, the milk of kindness and the honey of charity. To each and every class he would hold up a patron who could guide, inspire and console. For servant maids there would be the meek, toilsome Zita, for farmers the holy Isidore, for goldsmiths Eligius or Eloy, for shoemakers Crispin, for millers Paulinus, for carpenters the just St. Joseph, model of all workmen—for each class a patron saint from the calendar of the one Church which alone inspires men of all stations and occupations to sanctify themselves by their daily duties.

This is all very fine and beautiful, perchance, yet how impractica-

ble and even Utopian! Not so. Leo's words were not in vain. Belgium heard them and profited by them; so, too, in great measure did his own beloved Italy and Spain and France, though in a much less degree. And has not our own America begun to move slowly in the right direction? There is hope of better days, for if, as sages say, "the past is never dead, but is invisibly working itself out in the present," may we not trust that God in His own good time will bring all to a happy event? Be this our solace, as we wait in patience for the Master of life to raise up amongst us men of strong, clear heads and brave, clear hearts, apostles to the poor, who, scorning prejudice of caste and education, will strive with all the forces of will and intellect to bring about at least a partial return to the better spirit of the ancient guilds.

RICHARD H. TIERNEY, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CALIFORNIA MISSIONS.

THE fate of the Christian Indians in the present State of California deserves serious consideration as a record of the practical results of political dogmatism and reckless experimenting with the social conditions of a population by rulers of another race. The secularization of the missions there was based on motives very like those proclaimed by modern politicians in the Philippines. It was put forward as a measure to lead the native converts to a higher civilization than that which they had already received from instructors acting on the motives of religion and using them to win their pupils from a savage life. In words the policy of Governors Echeandia and Figueroa can hardly be distinguished from that of Governor Taft or Wright in another part of the world as proclaimed to-day. In California the policy was carried out, however, in fact, and its results can be readily traced. How far the latter were due to lack of ability or honesty in the officials who carried out the policy and how far to its intrinsic defects can be practically ascertained from history. Most of the official documents connected with secularization have been preserved by H. H. Bancroft in his history and library. They do not reveal a lower moral standard among the Mexican officials than the daily press to-day tells of our own average politicians. Whether the promises of the latter are more likely to be fulfilled may best

be estimated from a comparison of the promises of the early Mexican politicians with their performance.

The conversion of the savages in California was begun at the foundation of San Diego as a Spanish military post in 1769, the year of Napoleon's birth. The missionaries were Franciscans of the strict observance and members of the College of San Fernando in Mexico. The college was one of several communities organized specially for the spread of the faith among the natives of New Spain. It was a self-governed body in the Franciscan Order, made up of priests who desired to devote themselves to its special work. The members usually came when already ordained, and only a few novices entered. Each college drew recruits indifferently from all the Spanish Franciscan provinces, but in practice most of the members of the San Fernando community came from Catalonia, the Island of Mallorca and the Basque provinces. These districts in the eighteenth century retained more of the old mediæval Catholic life and religious spirit than most other parts of Spain. This character is very noticeable in most of the Californian missionaries, and there is no doubt but it contributed much to their success in winning the confidence of the savages of California. The college, however, was not exclusive in its membership, and Mexican friars were also found among the latter.

Though four or five of the Spanish friars were murdered during the work of conversion, the body was decidedly successful in winning the savages to Christian belief and settled life. Five priests came with the first expedition, and the number was increased to forty by the close of the eighteenth century. At that time about fourteen thousand converts had been enrolled and formed into village communities, self-supporting and self-ruled under direction of the friars. The number of these mission villages was then eighteen, spread from San Diego to the Bay of San Francisco. The European population at the time was about twelve hundred, mostly made up of Spanish soldiers and their families, and governed by the military commander of the posts. Two colonies of settlers had been sent at government expense and towns or villages formed at San Jose, Los Angeles and Branceforte, now Santa Cruz. The settlers and Indians were kept somewhat separate in their settlements. The Governors usually left the management of the latter to their teachers, though guards of four or five soldiers were placed at each mission. Indian converts were not taxed, and the management of their local discipline and methods of work was left to the friars who had formed each settlement. Two priests were placed at each mission, and the whole number in California was about forty at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was not

increased, but continued about the same till the close of Spanish rule in 1822.

Under this system the missions continued to grow in numbers and material prosperity during the next twenty years. The population increased to over eighteen thousand in 1810 and to about twenty-two thousand in 1823. Cultivation was extensively practiced, and the crop of 1820 reached a hundred and eighty thousand fanegas (about twelve thousand tons) of grain. Cattle and sheep owned by natives were nearly four hundred thousand. All the common manufactures of rural Spanish life were carried on by Indians in quantities ample for the use of the community. Woolen and cotton clothes, leather shoes, saddlery, pottery, soap making, smith, carpenter and mason work were produced by native labor. The mission churches and other erections were substantially built and decorated, and in food, dress, dwellings and amount of work the condition of the twenty thousand mission Indians was better than that of most European peasantry at the time. Hostilities with the savages were almost unknown and little crime existed. The natives were nearly all well instructed in religion, fairly industrious and contented with their lot. The friars gave book learning to only a few, but music and painting were widely taught. The Spanish language was also taught, but the majority continued to use their own languages, and their teachers were required to have knowledge of the dialects of their mission districts at least. A peculiarity of the system of the Spanish friars was their tolerant regard for native customs as far as not contrary to general Christian morality. Their native games were a feature of every mission holiday, and though regular work was insisted on as a duty, the friars regularly gave permission to parties to spend some weeks each year hunting and berry gathering in the fashion of their old life. They even used these excursions to cultivate the friendship of the pagan natives and induce them to join the missions.

The white population received little accession from the outside after the eighteenth century, but it increased very fast under the favorable condtions of climate, peace and plenty of supplies. The Spanish Californians numbered over three thousand in 1820, the majority of the men being still soldiers and occupied in various military duties. The settlers confined themselves to cattle raising and farming, and manufactures were confined to the mission Indians. They also raised most of the crops and supplied the garrisons with provisions, which were paid for by the authorities. There was no feeling of rivalry or ill will between the Europeans and natives in California at the time.

The European population, in spite of its military character, had

more resemblance to a peasantry of the Middle Ages than a modern colony. Public morals were strictly guarded, there was strong respect for religion and family life and but little literary culture. Provisions were abundant and wealth and poverty alike unknown. The officers usually rose from the ranks, and their families and the friars formed the only educated class, but there was little or no class feeling beyond that of military discipline. Schools were usually provided in the pueblos and presidios for elementary instruction, but a community of cattle raisers had little care for books. Music and embroidery were, however, general accomplishments of all classes. In general life in California under Spanish rule was singularly free from crime or cares.

That rule after fifty-four years' duration abruptly ended without either complaint or revolt. An insurrection in Mexico followed the seizure of the Spanish Kings by Napoleon and continued for twelve years without being noticed in California. It was nearly ended when a liberal military revolution in Madrid, in 1821, imposed a new constitution on the Spanish dominions. The Mexican royalists resented the change, and Iturbide, a Mexican officer, made an alliance with the insurgents and proclaimed the separation of Mexico from the new formed Spanish Government. The plan of Iguala proposed to continue the old Spanish monarchical regimé, and even invited the King to transfer his residence to Mexico as its head. A Council of Regency was meantime installed as the legitimate government, and was accepted even by the Viceroy, O'Donoju. The Council sent an envoy to California to state its case and ask the adherence of its soldiers and people to the new State. Governor Sola called his officers and the superiors of the Franciscans to council on the subject, and after some deliberation all agreed to accept the new State as their supreme authority. It was simply a case of necessity. The passing of the Spanish monarchy was already accomplished, and the Californians accepted the fact without bitterness or partisan feeling. National prejudice there was none in California at the time between European and creole Spaniards.

Governor Sola, a Spaniard by birth, was chosen deputy to the Mexican Congress and Captain Arguello, a native of California, elected Governor until an appointment should be made by the regency. In point of fact, he continued to rule with all the powers of his Spanish predecessors for the next three years. The Mexican Empire planned by Iturbide only lasted a year. The Spanish royal family were not asked to take the throne, and Iturbide had himself elected, only to be deposed by a majority in Congress. A republic was proclaimed as the national government and a year spent in

forming a constitution, during which time California was left to its own management. Governor Arguello accepted the various changes from empire to republic with military obedience to orders.

The first President of Mexico on his election in 1825 thus found his authority in California recognized like that of the late Spanish Kings. He had no motive for interfering with its system of administration or missions, but his administration was singularly unacquainted with California's special conditions. The old Spanish officials in Mexico had been nearly all expelled. Their successors were without experience of public business and further disposed on partisan policy to discredit the old system of administration as much as possible. The latter feeling was shown in the reports of Secretary Alaman and the congressional committee on Californian affairs. Both expressed respect for the good work of the Spanish friars in civilizing the savages, but at the same time declared that "something more" was needed to raise the converts to the standard of civic perfection. Secretary Alaman thought "nothing better fitted to lead men to the highest perfection than to bind individuals to society by the powerful bond of property." He advised, accordingly, the distribution of lands to the mission Indians and lending them part of the mission funds for beginning cultivation on their own account. Both he and the committee advised that the property already formed by the converts and recognized as theirs in common by the Spanish laws should be applied to establishing colonies of foreigners among them. The Secretary suggested that these might be of Chinese and convicts from Mexico! The committee further advised that rations and small salaries should be allowed to Mexican settlers from the mission funds. How far such a disposition of the property already accumulated by the natives was to bind them more closely to society than the common ownership of the mission system none of the statesmen seemed to explain further. It is a curious illustration of the practical ignorance of Californian conditions on the part of the politicians of the new republic that Secretary Alaman referred to Upper California as "a vast and fertile peninsula." The congressional committee urged the Governor sent to California should acquaint himself with Humboldt's essay on New Spain, the history of Father Venegas and the journal of Viscaino, two hundred years published. The recommendations show the curious ignorance of Mexican officials of the conditions of California at the time.

The first Republican Governor, Colonel Echeandia, was wholly unacquainted with his province when he assumed charge of it. He was received with the same respect as his Spanish predecessors had been, and had nearly the same military and civil powers. He began

by forming an assembly to act as his council, and had them elected by vote, but with the qualification that no military man could be chosen. As seven hundred of the male population were enlisted in military service, this new provision restricted the assembly to a few boys without experience or occupation. The Governor trained them in their supposed duties as he would a band of military recruits and the representatives obeyed his instructions as implicitly. He at first ordered the mission Indians to vote as electors, but after a couple of years dispensed with their right of franchise at his discretion. He levied, however, a heavy tax on their property and had his decree endorsed by the assembly. As the Spanish settlers had no property taxes the new burdens were resented by the natives. They made no attempt at open resistance, however. A little before Echeandia's coming Governor Arguello had suppressed a petty disturbance at La Purissima by the slaughter of fifty mission Indians. Their fellows only showed their discontent by deserting in some numbers from their missions to resume savage life in the mountains.

A new element of ferocity was introduced into the relations between the whites and the savages under Echeandia's rule. One of his Mexican officers after a fight with some hostiles near San Diego sent thirty-eight pair of ears as a trophy to the Governor. It was a marked change from the forbearance uniformly practiced towards the savages by the Spanish Governors, and it lessened the confidence which the mission Indians had in the general administration up to that time. Desertions became very numerous in consequence among them.

The policy of the administration in Mexico in another way had a still more disastrous effect on the missions in California. After the fall of Iturbide the dominant majority in Congress introduced a general proscription of Spaniards by birth as a measure of partisan politics. Spaniards were forbidden access to Mexico and the college of San Fernando was almost emptied of members. Its buildings for a time were occupied as a cavalry barrack and the supply of priests to California was entirely cut off. President Victoria ordered an oath of allegiance in an iron-clad form to be tendered to the Californian friars. It included a pledge to take up arms against Spain at command of the administration. Subsequent legislation ordered the expulsion of all of Spanish birth from Mexican territory regardless of the question of allegiance. The Mexican partisan legislation was not unlike the alien and sedition measures of John Adams' administration in our own land, but it affected a much larger class. In California it was never practically applied, as many of the officers and soldiers there as well as the friars were

of Spanish birth. It was, however, effective in excluding successors to the existing missionaries, as their numbers were thinned by death and sickness. Only three friars arrived in California from the San Fernando college after the establishment of Mexican rule. They were all of Mexican birth, but no more were available in the existing conditions. The whole number of the San Fernando friars was thirty-seven in 1823. It shrank to twenty-six in 1830 and to sixteen in 1835. Continuance of their work was clearly impossible under the conditions.

Governor Echeandia, it must be said, made no serious attempt to disturb the Spanish friars except in one case. He called on them to take the oath prescribed by the President shortly after his arrival, and the majority, including Father Sarria, the mission president, refused to take it except with the qualification "as far as consistent with their religious obligations." They were ready to promise obedience to the established government and to undertake nothing against its authority, but they refused on conscientious grounds the obligation of bearing arms against their native land or the King to whom they had sworn allegiance. While Echeandia was ready to use their refusal as political capital for his own loyalty with the administration, he declined to expel the recusants on the ground of public necessity for their services. In one case, when a revolt against his own authority was made by some long unpaid soldiers, headed by a Mexican convict, he thought fit to describe it a royalist insurrection, and to give color to the charge he exiled one of the friars, Father Martinez, as an accomplice, by military authority. The Governor, however, not only declined to exile other priests, but refused to let some who desired to retire permission to leave California. His description of the value of the services of the friar body in his despatches is in curious contrast to his complaints of their nationality during the greater part of his administration.

Though the mission system was not directly attacked, a decline in the numbers of the Christian Indians began with the rule of Echeandia. The discontent caused by the new taxation and distrust of the intentions of government after the slaughter of natives at La Purissima and Santa Barbara made many leave the missions during the next few years. At San Jose, in 1827, a body of a couple of hundred under the Alcalde Estanislao went to live with the savages of the mountains and carried on hostilities with the rancheros. Another body under Yoscolo did the same at Santa Clara a little later. In neither case was any violence offered the priests in charge. Yoscolo's party was nearly exterminated by a military expedition, and Estanislao after some time was induced to return, but the mission population continued to decrease. It

had been nearly twenty-two thousand when Arguello was elected Governor. It diminished to eighteen thousand five hundred in 1830, and to somewhat over fifteen thousand five years later. The decrease in the native population followed closely that caused in the ranks of their teachers by the proscription of Spanish friars on Mexican territory.

To supply the place of the latter both the Mexican authorities and Echeandia wished to obtain Franciscans of Mexican birth. The College of Zacatecas was organized on the same model as that of San Fernando, but its members were mostly recruited from Mexico. At the request of the President an agreement was made between the two colleges by which half the Californian missions were to be ceded to the Zacatecas College. The negotiations consumed much time, and in 1830 a new President, Bustamente, was elected in Mexico. His administration was distinctly favorable to the mission system in California. Echeandia the year before had suggested the appointment of government agents to manage the revenues of the mission communities. He would leave the friars to attend to their religious instruction and general discipline, but desired to relieve them of the care of the revenues. Echeandia's proposition was rejected by the Mexican Congress and he was recalled by the President. His successor, Victoria, reached California early in 1831. Echeandia had meantime proposed to secularize the missions by his own authority, in defiance of Congress, and had won the approval of the local assembly, a body of seven young men, to his scheme. The new Governor promptly dissolved the session and began his duties of office. Echeandia in a few months stirred up some of the young assemblymen to a revolt against his successor. Governor Victoria was wounded in a skirmish, made prisoner and sent back to Mexico. Some months of confusion followed, the office of Governor being disputed between Echeandia and another officer. Both parties professed loyalty to the Mexican authority, and its administration finally named another Governor, General Figueroa. Ten friars of the Zacatecas College were sent with him, and he had orders from the President not to disturb the missions in any way.

A revolution in Mexico came to make Bustamente's authority unavailing. Santa Anna displaced him by an armed insurrection, and Figueroa promptly accepted the new administration. He was a man of few scruples, immoral, a gambler and with little fidelity to any party, but a fair soldier and shrewd politician. He was said to be partly of Indian race and had won his rank as a soldier in the old insurrection. In California he found himself without funds or soldiers, and he made it his first point to form a party favorable

to his personality among the members of the assembly and other young native sons. Without revenue from Mexico the missions were the easiest resource available for a Governor in California, and Figueroa, like Echeandia, sought popularity with a section by the promise of naming administrators for the property of the unprotected mission Indians.

The sentiments of the majority of the Spanish Californians were entirely in favor of the friars and the mission system. A few months before Echeandia's recall he had received petitions from the municipalities of San Jose, Monterey and other towns expressing their devotion to the Spanish priests and protesting against any attempt to remove them. Echeandia himself complained strongly to Figueroa of their popularity, which he attributed to the fact that they gave their religious services gratis, practiced general hospitality at the missions and aided the poor with loans and gifts. The Indians were still more devoted to their teachers and to the system of common work which they had introduced. When Echeandia in 1830 sent some officers to suggest his plan of emancipation from control of the friars to the natives at San Luis Obispo and San Miguel they almost unanimously voted to remain as they were. A canvas of families made at San Diego on the same question by Figueroa showed only two out of a hundred and sixty who were willing to leave the mission and begin life as an independent village. At San Luis Rey no one could be found to accept the so-called emancipation out of a hundred and eight families questioned.

Figueroa himself as a politician had no sympathy with the Spanish friars, and even recommended in his first communication to Mexico the banishment of Fathers Sarria and Duran, the prefect and president of the body. In view of the decided sentiments of the Indians, however, he did not venture any attempt at secularization the first year of his term, though urged for appointments by the members of the assembly. He only tried the experiment at one mission, San Juan Capistrano, and the experience of a season showed a notable decrease there both in harvests and population. The Governor wrote to the Mexican ministry of the danger of sweeping changes, and it is probable he would not have attempted any but for a peculiar turn in politics at the capital. Santa Anna, the President, retired for some months and left the administration in the hands of Vice President Farias. The latter used his authority to grant the property of the Californian missions to a colonization company, in which he was himself a stockholder. The heads of the company were Colonel Padres, who had been Echeandia's second in command, and a wealthy Mexican named Hijar. Santa

Anna on his return to office at once cancelled the grant and sent orders to that effect to Figueroa. Two hundred colonists had meantime arrived with Padres and Hijar. Figueroa refused to put them in possession of the missions and sent them to settle at Sonoma, on the north side of the bay. He felt, however, that the attempt at spoliation might soon be renewed in the distracted condition of Mexican politics. He decided to forestall its renewal by promptly placing agents of his own choice in charge of the missions. He formed a plan, had it approved by the local assembly, and without consulting the general government installed administrators in sixteen missions before the close of 1834. His own death through apoplexy followed within a few months.

Figueroa's action was not approved by the Mexican Central Government, and indeed he received its orders not to change the state of the missions as soon as it was known. The condition of Mexico itself, however, was such at the time as to make its authority in California practically nothing. The constitution was changed in 1835 from a federal to a central republic, and local disturbances, including the secession of Texas, followed. The officer sent to replace Figueroa, Colonel Chico, resigned his office in a few months without any attempt to protect the missions. Indeed, he secularized two more, Santa Inez and San Buenaventura, in a fit of pique against the friars in charge of them. A young Californian official, Alvarado, shortly afterwards drove out the acting Governor by a bloodless revolution, in which the local assembly joined. Two years of confusion followed, in which rival candidates scrambled for the office of Governor, and the general government was helpless to restore order. Finally the President decided to recognize the young insurgent as Governor, and he held office with practically no control until 1842. The last two missions, Santa Clara and San Jose, were occupied by his agents in 1836, while Alvarado was still merely an insurgent leader.

It is peculiar that the seizure of the mission property by the Californian revolutionists was not accompanied by any disrespect towards the friars themselves. When Governor Chico, in 1836, attempted to arrest Father Duran at Santa Barbara his agents were driven away by the population. Figueroa himself repeatedly applied to the Franciscan prefect for advice and treated him with high respect. The Spanish nationality, which gave umbrage in the friars to Mexican politicians, was in fact claimed by most Californian settlers. Mexicans were regarded much more as foreigners in California at the time than European Spaniards were. The San Fernando friars retained the respect and good will of all classes in California down to the death of the last in 1850. They had no

property of their own, and their defense of the rights of their converts was wholly disinterested and so recognized by even the government agents.

The Mexican Franciscans sent to aid in their work suffered the same treatment from Governor Figueroa's measures as their Spanish brethren. They never as a body had the same popularity in California as the San Fernando friars, though there was no rivalry between the two classes. National prejudice had little share in the seizure of the Californian missions. Its work was confined to the politicians of the capital, but its result in excluding from the mission work of California the only class capable of carrying it out successfully was probably the chief cause of the ruin which fell on the native population.

The welfare and advancement of the Indians was, however, the motive claimed by the advocates of secularization. Echeandia declared that he undertook it "to remove the yoke from the poor conquered natives and let them enjoy their personal liberty, the fruit of their toil and the benefits of a Christian and civil education in schools." Figueroa thought it necessary to "raise the converts from their abasement, as they had only learned how to cultivate the soil, manage horses and practice a few trades, besides a slight and superficial religious instruction." Echeandia's statement to Figueroa of the advantages he expected to realize from secularization is a curious instance of optimistic hopes. "He knew it was best to give the converts a secular form of government, as once converted into proprietors from slaves they would become enthusiastic republicans, a defense against foreign invaders and the support of the territorial administration and its troops. Further, by leaving the missionaries free for founding new missions he proposed to advance rapidly to the civilization of the multitude of savages who were also part of the Mexican nation, and by their conversion dispense with the need of immigration of foreigners."

It seems hard to imagine that such results could be seriously looked for from the legislation proposed to bring them. That was merely to put political agents in charge of the Indians' properties and separate their industrial training from religious influences over their minds. The boarding schools for young girls founded at the missions to train the children in better habits than those of their parents were to be closed, and as a substitute the new agents were "to instruct the heads of families in their parental duties. Each adult Indian was to receive a legal title to his cabin and a plot of two acres of ground and also private ownership of two cows and horses. The emancipated converts, however, were still forbidden to leave their settlements and were to continue their com-

mon work as before. The only change proposed was that their work and its wages, their punishments and rewards were to be regulated by the Governor's agents instead of the unpaid friar administrators. The fact of the new rulers being political appointees would, in the eyes of Echeandia, soon give them superior administrative ability to that of the Spanish friars, who had drawn the savages from barbarism to their existing condition." We have seen equally sanguine anticipations on a like subject expressed by American politicians seventy-five years after Echeandia's time.

His programme was put into practice, with slight modification, by Figueroa and the local assembly, a body of seven young men without further experience of politics than the lessons they had received from the first Mexican Governor. Its practical results were soon evident. At San Juan Capistrano, the first mission taken over by Figueroa's agents, the crops fell to a quarter of their former amount the first year. An examination, made by orders of Alvarado, in 1840 showed that in five years' secularized administration the cattle and sheep of the natives had fallen from three hundred to one hundred thousand. Cultivation had almost ceased, except in the vineyards and orchards. Manufactures, weaving, tanning, flouring, building and mechanical work had been abandoned everywhere except at Santa Barbara and one or two other places. The residents in the secularized missions were scarcely five thousand of the twenty-two thousand that occupied them under Spanish rule. The whole number of Christian Indians, either in the missions or scattered through the ranches, was scarcely nine thousand. Half the number of the whole had either perished or returned to savage life in five years. Raids and Indian wars were constant, and the runaway Christians often united with the savages in both. The only social elevation resulting to those who left the missions was that a portion of them were employed as vaqueros and laborers by the Spanish ranchers at nominal wages or board alone. It was customary to treat them as slaves, and a system had grown up of seizing the gentile natives as forced laborers under pretence of punishment for cattle stealing or other charges. The whole population of California at the close of the Spanish rule had been about twenty-six thousand. In 1840, after five years' mission secularization and the anarchy following, it had shrunk to less than sixteen thousand and was steadily decreasing. Agriculture, manufactures and schooling had almost vanished.

The methods followed by the young Californian Governor and his agents were not directly hostile to the natives. Their rights to the property formed by their industry under the missionary management was not denied. The Governor only professed to admin-

ister it for the common interest on approved political principles. Their practical application was that the Governor used the cattle, grain and other produce of the Indian properties as belonging to the State, and gave orders against it as freely as drafts on the public funds. His agents obeyed without hesitation in most cases. Further, both they and the Governor freely made loans of mission property to private friends or political partisans without any pretence of public services rendered. Hardly any of those loans were ever repaid. The administrators did not limit their loans to cattle, but also sent the emancipated natives in bands to work for friends without wages, and freely used the lash to compel them to work. The workshops and even farming of the missions most of them were incompetent to manage, and they let them perish through neglect. The methods of the Spanish Californian lay administrators were, in fact, almost identical with those of the Indian agents of our own Government. The chief difference was that the first plundered the property formed by Indian labor itself, the latter the price paid for Indian lands by the Government. The effect on the natives was practically the same in either case.

The consequences of the secularization policy were too notorious to escape attention even of those prominent in advocating it. Governor Alvarado himself, after his legal recognition, tried in vain to stop the ruin. The powers of the agents were restricted, the slavery of the natives by hiring them out as laborers forbidden and the settlement of Europeans among the natives prohibited. All were returns to the mission system, which had been so fluently denounced a few years earlier. Still more significant was a request of the Governor to the Spanish and Mexican friars to appoint the needed lay mayor domos themselves. It was a virtual confession of the failure of secularization, and at the same time asking the Franciscan prefects to make it workable or assume for themselves a share in responsibility for it before the public. Both Father Duran and Father Gonzalez declined the proffered power of naming administrators, however specious the promises of the Governor. They were ready to give their own work to the natives as far as instruction was concerned, but neither would assume an empty authority over their direction which might be rescinded any moment at the exigency of party politics.

The Central Government of Mexico was equally alarmed at the decay of population and industries in California which had followed the destruction of the Spanish mission system. Its restoration could only be expected by agents like those who had built it up; but that class of men had been so long excluded by partisan prejudices that its revival could not be looked for. Congress and the

President, as the best they could do, obtained the erection of a diocese in California, with one of the Franciscan missionaries as its first Bishop. The pious fund for support of the missions was transferred to his management. The Bishop was asked to employ it in forming and maintaining a secular clergy to replace the fast disappearing friars. The President a little later ordered that the mission properties should be placed again in control of the latter. The Central Government had recovered some power in California through the general disgust of its people with the incompetent rule of Alvarado. Petitions were sent for the nomination of a new Governor and the sending of a body of Mexican troops to maintain order in the territory and protect it against foreign invasion. The President sent General Micheltorena in 1842, with about three hundred men. He had orders to restore the missions to the management of the friars, without distinction of Spanish or Mexican.

The change was made in 1843, but only extended to twelve of the twenty-one former missions. In the other nine the population had disappeared to an extent which made it hopeless to restore them. The Governor showed good will, but he had little means of giving effective help in recovering the property stolen or lent by the lay administrators. He granted, however, a tract of six leagues public land near Santa Inez to the Bishop for the support of a seminary. The condition of the missions of the south was reported on by Father Duran in 1844 shortly after the recession. San Diego had only a hundred natives left on its lands of the eighteen hundred that occupied them in Spanish times. They had neither cattle nor cultivated ground to support them. San Luis Rey had four hundred of the twenty-eight hundred that lived there under the benevolent Father Peyri. San Gabriel had three hundred, who made a livelihood by cultivation of its vineyards; Santa Barbara nearly the same, mainly depending on work in the mission shops, which had still been kept open by Father Jimerio.

From nearly every mission came like figures of material ruin. There were but eight left of the Spanish friars, who had been thirty-seven when the rule of Mexico was accepted in 1822. The Mexican Franciscans just kept up their original number often, and there was no means to increase them in the existing conditions of Mexico. The politicians of the young republic twenty years earlier desired to remove the Spanish missionaries and keep their missions much as Charles III. had banished the Jesuits from Lower California and found successors to continue their work in the Spanish Franciscans. The process could not be repealed at the whim of political prejudice. The disappearance of the Franciscans from Californian soil was followed by that of the population formed and guided by

them. The government which brought this result only survived the destruction of the missions by less than a year.

The well-meant effort to form a secular clergy to keep up the work of the Franciscan missionaries by the ordinary agencies of the Church was doomed to failure also. Bishop Garcia Diego began a seminary, but could find no candidates for the priesthood among the native Californians even with the promise of liberal salaries for clerical duties. He brought four or five students from Mexico, two of Indian race, and ordained three, but no further recruits offered themselves. The financial promises of the republican authorities were made of little avail by the difficulties of the administration to find funds for its own maintenance. The President applied to the Bishop's agent for a "loan" to meet the demands on himself of Federal officeholders. When it was refused the administration of the fund was put back in the hands of a government agent. Within a couple of years its estates were sold to tide over some urgent deficit in the treasury. The government at the same time disclaimed any purpose of confiscation. It declared the fund sacred to its original purposes and merely borrowed it as a matter of State necessity.

The situation thus created in California was made worse by a local insurrection against the Mexican Governor. The mission properties no longer offered any large plunder, and the insurrection seems to have been merely an ebullition of boyish recklessness on the part of a section of the native Californians. The only motive alleged was that the Mexican soldiers sent to garrison the forts were of inferior moral character, though no serious outrages were complained of. Micheltorena gave up his office rather than wage war, and a native Californian, Pio Pico, was installed as Governor simply on the ground of being oldest in the local assembly. He promptly ordered a sale of the remaining mission lands on his own authority. The sole motive was to satisfy the claims of a few personal partisans who had aided in the insurrection. The sales were ordered in 1845, and within less than a year the American invasion followed. The revolutionary Governor promptly left the country and the rule of Mexico ended within a year of the destruction of the native mission communities.

The Christian Indians received no benefit from the change of government. Only two of the Spanish friars survived when the conquest was completed, and no advocate of native rights appeared to take their place, though the latter were guaranteed by the treaty which transferred California to the Union. The survivors were scattered in small parties into remote districts, where the barren soil offered no temptation to encroachment by white men. Their

number to-day is estimated at about four thousand. Their present condition was summed up three years ago by Mr. Lummis, an American publicist, who had been commissioned to investigate it by the administration: "The former owners of this land have been dispossessed of their fertile valleys, sometimes under color of law, sometimes at the end of a shot gun, and driven back on the ragged edge of the desert. Almost nothing that a white man would take as a gift has been left these original Americans."

The practical result of the secularization policy inaugurated by the policy of a couple of Mexican Governors "to raise the mission Indians from the abasement of their condition" could not be more clearly told. One asks whether better may be expected from attempts to raise the standard of civilization of other races won from barbarism by Catholic teaching and now submitted to plans of moral reformation through political agencies.

B. J. Clinch.

San Francisco, Cal.

DO THE FILIPINOS REALLY HATE THE SPANISH FRIARS?

II.

THE Filipino, if he gets into any position, is always a tyrant and oppressor of the poor, and what chance has the latter of legal redress for the most crying wrongs if the President and Secretary and Judge of the Peace, all native, conspire to deprive him of his rights? One of the great reasons why the friar had to intervene in local secular affairs in Spanish times was to protect the rights of the poorer classes. The priest was the father of the poor in the Philippines, as he is in every other part of the world. Naturally these criminals are afraid that if the friars return the poor will go to them, their former advisers and protectors, whom they had always looked to for the redress of their grievances, and bring the illegal and unjust doings to the light of day. Little does the American journalist, in search of information, suspect what crimes against humanity may underlie the discourse of the suave, polished and well-spoken Filipino, who assures him of the violent and general hatred existing among the poorer classes for the Spanish friar.

The journalist who wrote a series of letters from the Philippines

for a newspaper syndicate, amongst other inaccuracies he fell into, said that "most of the friars were living idly in Manila, as they could not go into the country for fear of the vengeance of the former parishioners." The fact is that in spite of all drawbacks, in spite of the virulent hatred of the irreligious element, the interested motives of a local opposition and the cowardice of their own friends, about a hundred of the friars of the different orders are to be found in the provinces. Of those living in Manila very few are available for outside parish work, and even the orders have had to refuse some parishes. Of the Dominicans, owing to the number employed in teaching in the university and their three colleges, and the development of their missions in China and Japan, not more than seven or eight could go back to the parishes. Our journalist seems to think that the only reason that keeps the friars in Manila is to look after their property. Has he been present at any of the grand religious functions in their churches, not to be surpassed in any other city of the world? Has he witnessed the magnificent religious processions through the streets of the city, taken part in by many thousands? He is evidently not aware that many of their former parishioners seek them out in Manila to unburthen their consciences to them in the confessional. Naturally, too, the Spaniards when they attend their religious duties prefer to go to them than to any others. A good number of friars are required in Manila from the fact that a large portion of the spiritual work of the city is in their hands.

As to the work in the provinces, at present there are four Dominican Fathers in Manaoag, one in the province of Bataan, two in Lingayan, six in the college at Dagupan, nine in the college of Tuguegarao, while five are acting as missionaries in the small Batanes Islands to the north of Luzon. The Franciscans hold between twenty or thirty parishes in the southern provinces of Luzon and in Samar, and one father is parish priest of Baler, where he was kept in captivity for twenty-two months during the revolution and the war with America. His persecutor is now confined in Bilibid prison, convicted of several murders. The fathers, owing to the scarcity of priests, have generally two or three parishes under their charge and are doing herculean work. They all seem to take a very hopeful view of their position in the provinces. More have been petitioned for, but the difficulty now is that the supply in Manila has fallen short, there being hardly enough friars in the Franciscan convent to keep up the Divine worship. The Recoleto friars are in Cebu, Bacoor (Cavite), Infanta and Candelaria (Zambales), Calapan (Mindoro), Cuyo (Calamianes), Puerto Princesa (La Paragua), Bacolod, Murcia, Minuluan, San Carlos (Negros),

Palilan and Aloran (Mindanao), and some fathers are on the missions in the Marianas Islands. The Augustinians have two fathers in the north of Luzon and several others in the Island of Paney and in the town of Cebu. In view of the tremendous opposition, this is a fair showing, but after all what are these for the guidance of nearly seven millions of Catholics?

One of the grave questions that the Church in the Philippines will have to solve in the near future is the support of the priests. In Spanish times they had their salary from the government, an arrangement that relieved them from sordid cares and enabled them without difficulty to keep the church and convent in good repair. In addition they had the burial and marriage fees and the alms for Masses. As at present they have to depend entirely on those latter sources of income, there being no such thing as collections in the churches, and the Filipino not being by nature an alms-giver, especially the rich, it may be imagined that the position of the friars in the provinces is not a bed of roses. The head convents in Manila, except the Franciscan, have been heavily taxed for the support of some of the priests, especially those on the missions. I made inquiries in one convent situated in a large capital town as to the amount of fees received during the year for burials and marriages, the fees being generally about a dollar, and found that they amounted to $268 for the year, one-eighth of which was to be set apart as church funds for repairs, and the rest, together with what alms was received for Masses, had to suffice for the entire support of two priests. This shows badly by the side of the American teacher of the primary school, who gets at least a salary of $1,000 a year. As the graveyards belonging to the churches, which used to be an additional source of income, have been seized in most instances by the municipalities, who divide the fees among themselves, there is no possibility of making extensive repairs to the churches and convents, and most of them are in a dilapidated state. The furniture in the convents is of the most meagre description, sometimes being a loan from friends in the town or village, while the possessors of the stolen property, which formerly belonged to them, such is the mystery of the Filipino character, will not only be seen in the church at Mass, but will meet the fathers in an amiable and friendly way without showing or feeling any sense of shame.

Turning back to the period of the revolution, the attitude of the parishioners to their friar pastors during that awful period has been very much misrepresented. It is cunningly explained that the war was not made against Spain, but against the religious orders, and was the outgrowth of the hatred felt by a people groaning under "monastic oppression." The first news wired to Europe from the

news agencies in Hong Kong was that the people had everywhere risen in rebellion against the "monks," as they were called, had killed some and were pursuing others through the mountains.

Thus public opinion was prejudiced from the start, for it was inferred that tyranny or oppression of some magnitude must have been practiced by the friars that drove the people to such extremities. This was the first of the many absurd and malicious reports sent to Europe during the year 1898. Now, in no single instance was a friar made prisoner or maltreated by his own parishioners; the truth is, that it was not the people of the parishes who rose against the friars, but the Katipunero revolutionists, almost all Tagalos from the provinces of Manila or Cavite. Great numbers of these had never known the friars as pastors, had had very few relations with them and were the usual proletariat to be found in and near all great cities and seaports, ready for crime at all times and ripe for revolution. To these must be added the bandits (*tulisanes*) of the mountains of Cavite and Batangas, who in company with criminals escaped from justice, had pursued brigandage as an hereditary profession for generations. This rabble formed into bands with military organization, and armed with guns and rifles taken from the arsenal of Cavite or supplied from his stores by Admiral Dewey, overran the whole country like a horde of barbarians, striking terror into friend and foe alike, pillaging and maltreating peaceful Chinamen traders and their own countrymen, burning the houses of those who did not show them active sympathy, besieging the scattered detachments of the Spanish military forces and taking possession of the towns in the name of the "Philippine Republic," leaving in them their own military governors, to whom the presidents were ordered to pay implicit obedience. The friars had ample time to leave their parishes after the first alarm, but in most instances deferred their departure till the Katipuneros were almost at their heels. Finding then it was too late to get to Manila, encircled at the time by the revolutionary forces, they took refuge in the towns garrisoned by the Spaniards and were taken prisoners when the latter capitulated. Several of the friars of Pangasinan, after leaving their parishes with the church plate, vestments and funds, were taken at the surrender of Dagupan. A large number drawn from Cagayan, Ilocos and La Union, together with the Bishops of Vigan, were taken at the surrender of Aparri while waiting for a ship to convey them to Hong Kong. Several also were made prisoners after the capitulation of Cebu. In all these instances their capture and subsequent ill treatment were the work of the Tagalo Katipuneros.

By the terms of the capitulations, formally signed by the Tagalo

chiefs, they were to go free, their lives and property being respected, but the treaties were shamefully broken by these ruffians as soon as the Spaniards were in their power. Lowering themselves to the level of common bandits, they made prisoners of men, women and children, including the friars, in expectation of large ransoms from the Spanish Government. This execrable perfidy was committed by direct orders from Aguinaldo and the other chiefs of the new Republic, who should thereby forfeit all right to a place in public estimation. The siege of Calamba, the town belonging to the great Dominican estate, by Paciano Rizal, the brother of the famous Dr. José Rizal, is a case in point. Rizal treated the friars most respectfully when the Spanish soldiers had capitulated, and, as had been agreed, facilitated their return to Manila. When, however, they got to the revolutionary lines drawn around the city they were made prisoners and brought to Cavite to Aguinaldo, the pass given by Rizal, a general of their own army, being utterly disregarded.

In the southern islands the friars remained quietly at their work for weeks after the revolution had begun in Luzon, never imagining that they would be disturbed so far away from the scene of operations. However, the Tagalo bands sailed south and were guilty of the same course of perfidy and violence as in the north. All the friars could have saved themselves at their leisure, as did those of the province of Capiz, who sailed to Manila, taking with them the church funds of the province, amounting to $70,000.

The cruel sufferings and humiliations endured during their long captivity were entirely the work of the revolutionary leaders and could not be attributed except in occasional instances to the rank and file of the Katipunero soldiery. Against all the rules of civilized warfare they affected to regard them as criminals amenable to justice for crimes committed against the people, and not as prisoners of war. Aguinaldo and his Cabinet, helped in this course by the advice of the American Consul at Hong Kong, kept more than two hundred friars prisoners for eighteen months, subjecting them at the beginning to outrages and torture to extract confessions relating to the disposal of church funds, and forcing many of them to engage in menial and filthy occupations, such as scraping the streets, cleaning outhouses and serving at table as servants.

The Spanish soldiers, new conscripts, who had never handled a gun before they came to the Philippines, were subjected to similar treatment and made to work as slaves. More than eighty Spanish marines captured at Cavite, after bearing their awful lot for more than a year, were deliberately murdered by a Tagalo general when the American troops advanced on his position. This was the inhuman conduct of men who posed as the saviors of their country,

vaunted their noble aspirations before the world and thought themselves capable of setting up a civilized government over the ruins they had made.

The real feelings of the people as distinguished from the Katipuneros were made manifest on the memorable journey made by the friar prisoners in company with a large number of Spanish prisoners of war from Cavite to the north of Luzon, passing in their way through the Tagalo and Ilocano provinces. Except in two or three of the Tagalo towns, centres of the revolutionists and where pandemonium reigned, they were not insulted; on the contrary, in spite of orders that the people were to have no intercourse with them, they were usually received with respect and kindness by the president and the leading families, and got food and other comforts so readily that some of the Spanish soldiers shaved their heads and tried to pose as friars to receive the same good treatment. The respect shown by the people reacted on their guards, who treated them with far more lenience than they meted out to the Spanish soldiers.

Lieutenant Gilmour, who with twelve other American naval prisoners had to march for several days with the column, notices in his account of his captivity the cruel treatment meted out to the soldiers, the poor fellows being cruelly beaten to make them march on when they were hardly able to stir. This never happened to the friars, who were treated with consideration by the rank and file of the Katipuneros and were never assaulted except by special commands. "You are good men," they would sometimes say. "We know you are good men; it is the religious orders that are bad." Of real hostility to the friars there was none. "What are you doing all this for?" said a friar one day to his guards. "Independence," was the sapient reply. "What is independence?" he asked. "Cuba, Cuba," was all the explanation that could be elicited. As in most revolutions, the bulk of them were led by the nose and did not know what they were fighting for. In Isabela the friars were treated very well by the first Tagalo band that came and made them prisoners. It was not till the arrival of the chiefs, Leyba and Villa, that they were subjected to beating and other tortures in order to extract money. Father Martinez, the present prior of Santo Domingo, in Manila, was beaten twice to insensibility by Leyba's orders to make him confess where he had placed the church funds, amounting to several thousands of dollars. He had managed to send them to Manila, where they were taken care of by the procurator of the Dominican Order till the arrival last year of Dr. O'Doherty, the American Bishop of Vigan, when they were handed over to him as head of the diocese. Leyba also threatened to shoot the present sub-prior of Santo Domingo, Father Peña, if he did not declare

that Jesus Christ was not present in the Blessed Sacrament. "Shoot away," was the heroic answer. "You might as well shoot and have done with it." Leyba lowered the revolver and shot him in the leg. This Leyba, a half Spaniard, was assassinated afterwards by his own soldiers for his cruelties. Villa, the other chief, who is now practising as a doctor in Manila, is a Tagalo who received his education gratis from the Dominican friars at the University of St. Thomas, in Manila, and went to Aguinaldo's camp as his follower and physician the very morning after he had received his degrees. In Isabela he insulted and struck one of his former professors and kicked the Bishop of Vigan in the stomach and broke his arm because he would not ordain a certain young man he proposed to him. He tortured to death a Spanish lieutenant of the Guardia Civil against whom he had a grudge, hanging him up and cutting off pieces of his flesh, which he shoved into his mouth, subjecting him to other abominable and indescribable outrages and for three days and nights gloated over his agonies till death mercifully took him out of his power. After the departure of Leyba and Villa the friars in Isabela received no more bad treatment till the end of their imprisonment. In the Island of Negros, where the Tagalos had no sway, it having formed a government of its own, the friars, though imprisoned according to the general policy pursued, were not subjected to ill treatment; in fact, one of the heads of the new government spent some hundreds of dollars out of his own private fortune in sending them necessaries. They were all released after three months, their release being accelerated from the circumstances that their former parishioners were coming in crowds every day to condole with them and bring them presents. The prison was fast becoming a place of pilgrimage.

Capital has been made by the mendacious Foreman out of the assassination of friars, of which forty cases occurred between 1896 and 1898, by representing them as acts of vengeance committed on tyrants by an oppressed and infuriated people. At least that will be gathered from the cool and dispassionate way in which he records them and the sneers with which he follows some of the victims to their untimely end, all the more remarkable in a man who had enjoyed free and unlimited hospitality from the friars for years in his journeys through the islands and counted personal friends, such as Father Moises Santos, of Malolos, among the slain. Except in a man of perverted moral sense and consummate hypocrisy the attitude is incomprehensible, especially as when he alleges cruelty on the part of Spain he reprobates it in the strongest terms. When analyzed the murders do not bear the interpretation put on them, the greater number having happened at the first onset of the

revolution, when the bloody statutes of the Katipunan society founded by Andres Bonifacio, a warehouse porter in Manila, decreed death to all Spaniards—men, women and children—and found victims of both sexes and all ages. Seventeen friars were killed in Cavite in the rising of 1896, most of them at the defense of the estate house at Imus, where with a few lay Spaniards they were besieged by the first revolutionary band, which included a number of bandits from the mountains. After expending their ammunition they made a sally and were killed indiscriminately in the heat of the conflict as they fled fighting towards the seashore.

It is foolish to represent them as agrarian murders committed by the tenants on the friars' estates, apparent from the fact that the following year when the trouble was over for a time all the old tenants were back on the farms working away as usual under the superintendence of the lay Brother in charge. Three other friars in the same province taken prisoners by Aguinaldo were foully murdered in prison by Andres Bonifacio. Outside this province no prisoners were murdered during the first rising. At the beginning of the rebellion in 1898, and in a few instances before it, seven were assassinated in Zambalez, three in Bataan, five in Bulacan, one in Tarlac, one in Pampanga, three in Ilocos and three in Cebu. It will be noticed that nearly all the murders occurred in the Tagalo provinces around Manila. For all the other provinces, in which were eight or nine hundred defenseless friars, the only murders claimed are the three in Cebu. Even in the Tagalo provinces the murderers were not local men, but in most instances Katipunero chiefs sent from Manila to organize the rising. Considering the bloodthirsty programme of the Katipuneros, the orders given by Bonifacio and sworn to by his followers to murder every Spaniard, without distinction of sex, and also that the very first victims of the bloody orgie intended were not Spaniards, but some harmless Chinese in Caloocan murdered in cold blood, the wonder is that the friars were not slain in hundreds. What argument can be drawn from the assassination of a certain number of them when we reflect on the thousands of murders committed by the Tagalo Katipuneros on their own countrymen about the same period, including the massacre of 150 Machabebe soldiers after the capitulation of Samal? Add to this account the hundreds of lay Spaniards, including prisoners of war and others, hundreds of Chinese traders and coolies, American soldiers tortured and buried alive, all victims of Tagalo cruelty and lust of blood, and it will be felt how ridiculous is the assumption that the friars were an object of vengeance, except to a few, or that the revolution was brought about principally on account of them.

The following is a remarkable instance of utter failure of the Katipunan leaders to enlist the mass of the population in their campaign of cruelty of the friars while they had them in their power in prison: They sent round to all the parishes inviting them to forward bills of complaints against the friars that they might punish them for their past misdeeds. They were thankful for any contribution of this nature, however trifling or childish, Leyba having given a friar a severe beating for having used a humorous expression about the Philippines in a letter written by him six years before to another friar and found among the latter's papers. The friars got several hints of what was intended and felt very anxious, as they were aware that their enemies would take every advantage of the most absurd accusation to torture and revile them. However, the communications received from the parishes were generally so laudatory of the friar pastors, advantage being taken of the occasion to add a petition for their return and restoration, that it was deemed more prudent to shelve them and let the whole matter drop.

It was in 1900, when the friars had all escaped from captivity and were crowded in Manila, that the controversy about their return to the parishes began, which has been carried on with such bitterness by their enemies ever since. The provincials of the orders, in their evidence given before the Taft Commission, declared, as we have already seen, that they were in constant communication with the parishioners, and added that the friars could go back as soon as their personal safety could be guaranteed, but that the provinces were then entirely under the control of the Katipunan Society.

When the insurgents had lain down their arms and the provinces were under the rule of American military governors the restoration was baffled by the native clergy, many of them past insurgents and members of the Katipunan Society, who, united almost to a man, moved heaven and earth to keep the friars out. The good of religion was entirely subordinated by them to their own personal interests, and it is no exaggeration to say that it is owing to their selfish policy more than to any other cause that the Filipino people have been largely deprived of spiritual ministrations ever since, the children left without religious instruction and the churches in the unoccupied parishes seized by the Aglipayans, these seizures going on up to the present time. In my journeys through the islands I interviewed many of these pastors of souls and hardly ever could elicit a word of regret as to the inadequate number of priests, even in parishes consisting of 20,000 or 30,000 Catholics. An American who had spent nearly four years as military governor over one of the southern provinces and had learned the true inwardness of the

situation told me he had met cases in which a strong opposition had manifested itself among the people of a parish when a proposal would be made to restore the friars, that reasons would be given and accusation made of every crime, but that on examination he would find that it was all the work of a subservient mob led on by the native priests, who did not want to vacate the positions given to them by the revolutionists nor relinquish the church revenues, which they were spending without giving an account of to any superior. A proof to his mind that the real sentiments of the people were not as represented was the fact that when there was no native priest in a parish there was no opposition, but where there was one quite the opposite sentiment seemed to prevail, and he cited particular instances that had come under his personal observation. Coming from a non-Catholic, this evidence may be considered important. To the native priests must be attributed the strongly-worded petitions presented to the American military governors from the very parishes where the friars had had the recent evidence of their own eyes of the real sentiments of the people towards them. In the Cagayan valley, north of Luzon, the keeping out of the friars may be attributed very largely to the efforts of one old priest who belonged to a prominent family and exercised enormous influence. If that influence had been used in the right direction he could have installed them in every parish, bearing down all opposition from the Katipuneros, who were very weak in that part of the country.

The Katipunan, the Supreme Society of the Sons of the People, to give it its full title, did not cease to exercise a malign influence over the people even when the war was over. Torture and death were threatened to those who showed sympathy with the Spanish friars, who spoke well of them or helped their cause, just as it had been applied during the war to their own fellow-countrymen suspected of being *Americanistas*. This society has aroused the dormant anti-racial hatred of the Asiatic for the white man, a feeling considerably strengthened during the sanguinary course of the war, and thus a new element has been introduced into the anti-friar campaign that did not exist before. The friars are white men—why should they, members of that dominant race, be allowed to come back to the parishes and exercise that unbounded influence over the Filipino people that they would have as their pastors? The Katipuneros would pitch every American teacher or soldier or civilian into the sea if they could, but why try the impossible?

The Federal party, formed at the breaking up of the insurrectionary forces and occupying a commanding influence in the islands, gave a wonderfully organized strength to the anti-friar opposition. Though not professedly an anti-Catholic party, it acts as such and

speaks as such by its leaders, who are atheists, freethinkers and men high placed in the ranks of Latin Freemasonry. They would drive the friars out of the Philippines on the same principles on which the religious orders have been driven out of France. Against the three-fold opposition emanating from the native clergy for personal reasons, the Katipunan from anti-racial rancor, and the Federal party from anti-religious and anti-Christian principles, it was impossible to make headway, though all these classes formed but a small minority of the population; so great numbers of the friars set sail from Manila to seek in other lands a more favorable field for their labors. Still more would have left only that Mgr. Chapelle, who stood nobly by the friars in this crisis when they seemed abandoned by all their friends, counseled them to remain in Manila and wait for better times.

Every year, however, the situation has become more difficult, owing to the rise of Aglipayism, a revolutionary movement, the daily tendency of which, in conjunction with the Filipino press, consists of a vilification of the friars and everything relating to them. During the seven years that have passed since the friars left the provinces a new generation of youths has grown up who were only little boys when the friars lived amongst them. It is in the ranks of these that Aglipay counts many converts to his political schemes. Their young minds have been perverted by the vile Filipino press and the vulgar diatribes of the Aglipayan ministers. The *fraile* is in their eyes the embodiment of tyranny and every vice—just the popular Protestant idea of the Jesuit that still lingers among the English. And here let it be noted of what astounding import mere words may be to a simple and ignorant people. In Spanish times the word *fraile* was never known in common parlance. The friar was addressed by the endearing term of *padre*, and this appellation was always used by the natives when speaking of their pastors. They were *los padres*, or *the fathers*. Even the lay Brothers, managers of the estates, got the same title by courtesy from the tenants and servants, and right proud they were of it. The word *fraile* only came into common use among the Spanish in the Philippines when it had become in their mouths a term of contempt, and in this degenerated state was handed over to the anti-clerical Filipinos. In some parts of the islands a particularly noxious and stinging insect has received this name, undoubtedly from the Spaniards. The anti-clerical Filipinos have improved on this. In the list brought out by the new Tagalo Academy they translate *fraile* by mountebank, giving the alternate translation of fat-paunch in addition. Cognate words have been coined as terms of reproach and contempt, such as *frailero* and *frailista*, both of

which mean a friend or partisan of the friars. The friar, therefore, at present seems to many an ignorant Filipino to have two sides and present a double character. As a *padre* he arouses pleasant memories of the past, and is everything that is good and lovable; as a *fraile* he stands out as the object of the incessant vituperation of the past few years, and is everything that is bad and noxious. Can it be wondered at that the mind of the common laborer is in a state of bewilderment that is positively amusing? He likes the *padres*, but he does not like the *frailes*. On one occasion the population of a parish petitioned for the service of a priest. "Send us," they said, "Augustinian Fathers or Dominicans, we do not care which, but do not send us any *frailes*." It is possible that in time, when the memory of the friars has entirely disappeared and other generations have grown up under new conditions, that the falsehoods about them may have grown into a strong tradition, to the entire exclusion of the truth, as happened in England with regard to the monks after the Protestant Reformation. It may be that in half a century from this the memory of these glorious champions of the faith may be held in execration as tyrants and oppressors of the poor. It is well, therefore, to anticipate that time and let the world know that the friars in the Philippines have had the same record of self-sacrifice and love of the poor and lowly that has distinguished Catholic missionaries in all other lands, and that they possessed the love and veneration of their flocks up to the last moment they were with them.

The young blood in the Aglipayan movement is a new factor in the problem which will make it more difficult of solution for some years to come. I remember a very unpleasant experience I had in a town in Pangasinan, where I had gone from Manila to assist at the *fiesta* at the invitation of the school teacher. There had never been the smallest friction in this town between the friars and the people; in fact, the last of the fathers, a specially zealous and charitable man, was remembered by the people with veneration. However, Aglipayism was introduced into the town by one of the Filipino school teachers, who managed to range under its standard most of the youths and schools boys, so that before long hardly a young man was seen at Mass on Sundays. The influence of the new spirit was apparent from the fact, which I learned afterwards, that those zealous converts had determined to stone me for my presumption in entering the town, and were only deterred from their project by the president stating at a meeting specially convened for the occasion that if I were attacked he would be obliged to defend me with the aid of the police, according to his interpretation of Governor Taft's letter about the rights of friars as citizens.

The consequence was that I experienced nothing worse than black looks. The attitude of the common people towards me, who had gathered in thousands from the surrounding country, was most mystifying. If these people came to Manaoag it would be most difficult for me or any other friar to pass through them, owing to the desire of all to salute and kiss the hand of the priest, whereas here I walked through the crowd in the Dominican habit, seen for the first time in the town since the revolution, and there was no greeting, no salute, no surprise expressed, numbers appearing not even to see me. No one equals the ordinary Filipino in the power of concealing his feelings by an apathetic look; his face seldom betrays him. A few youths and boys had cowed that multitude into a show of neutrality and utter indifference. If I had been attacked not a hand would have been raised to assist me. At the school celebration in the evening a young Aglipayan minister attacked the doctrine practised by the Catholic Church under cover of an attack on the friars, and although the parish priest was present as well as another native priest and the audience was Catholic, not a murmur of disapproval was heard from any one. When I got up to protest I found no one to second me, my remarks being received in profound silence. What can be expected of a people who show such arrant cowardice, who are so destitute of moral courage? Is it a wonder they allow themselves to be led like sheep by any leader who presents himself? If the good Catholics were a little more resolute the course of events would take a different direction.

It is, however, surprising how in places where the sinister influences we have described have not been at work or have ceased working for a time, the old order of things is ready to assert itself and the innate love and respect of the people for the friars to make itself manifest. The case received an illustration in the early part of the present year, when two Dominican friars, professors in the University of Manila, took a journey to the province of Albay, the great centre of the hemp industry and at present the most prosperous of all the provinces. On the excursions they made to several parts of the province during their two months' stay there they were received with the greatest cordiality by the native clergy and the people, who feted them in their houses and insisted on their taking the time-honored gifts in those parts of chickens and eggs. The clergy engaged them to preach in their churches during Holy Week, when all classes crowded to hear their sermons. This extraordinary manifestation of feeling was attributed by them in great measure to the circumstance that the clergy were the first to do them honor, gave them hospitality in their presbyteries and accompanied them from place to place on their journeys.

The melancholy truth apparent to the least observant mind is that the six or seven millions of Filipino Catholics are being robbed of their faith by intimidation and violence, with as fixed a determination as in any other country cursed by the presence of Latin Freemasonry, mercilessly robbed of the faith introduced and kept alive amongst them for three centuries and a half by the heroic and self-sacrificing labors of the Spanish friars. The same process is being carried through its stages there which has reduced the more flourishing Christian population of South America to their present level. Education and contact with Europe produces a class of natives and half-breeds in tropical climes who combine with revolutionary and anarchic ideas the most advanced forms of militant atheism. They regard the practices of the Catholic religion by their poorer countrymen as fanaticism and contemn the most elementary justice and fair play in their efforts to stamp it out. Let the Philippines be granted independence, and it will not be long in arriving at the same stage as Venezuela, where no foreign priest, regular or secular, is allowed to land in the country. The only hope is that the American sovereignty over the islands will be always strong enough to put down intimidation and secure that personal liberty to the people and their pastors which is enjoyed by the Catholics in the United States. Freedom if given at present to the revolutionary party would mean the reducing of nine-tenths of the Filipinos to the most abject slavery and the destruction of the Catholic religion in the Philippine Archipelago.

AMBROSE COLEMAN, O. P.

Limerick, Ireland.

THE NATURE OF CATHOLIC MYSTICISM.

STRANGE as the statement may sound in the midst of the rush and the riot of our merely industrial pursuits and ambitions, it is nevertheless true that the spirit of mysticism is in the air. Spiritualism in most, if not in all of its features, Christian Science, Theosophy, or which is practically the same thing, Buddhism, even Hypnotism in its illegitimate uses, and the many other forms of the occultism which prevails to-day, are simply diverse practices of a false and reprehensible mysticism. The country is covered with the votaries, victims, priests and priestesses of the occult. It is, in fact, a sign of the times. On the one hand, the old heresies have been riddled to pieces by the persistent attacks

of modern science, the license of private interpretation, higher criticism, journalistic ridicule, secular education and the growing contempt in which all shams and pretences in the garb of religion are everywhere held in literature and in the life of the people. These heterodox makeshifts for spirituality and communion with the Unseen no longer appeal to the people nor possess any credit with thinking men and women. They never did make men holy, and now they have ceased even to render them religious. On the other hand, man instinctively leans towards the mystic. Perhaps it would be too radical, as it is certainly untrue, to say that by nature he is superstitious. Yet it is not only true, as Tertullian writes, "quod anima humana est naturaliter Christiana," but it is even more certain that man is curious about God and everything touching the departed; about spirits, heaven, hell, the forces of nature, the hidden powers of his own being and the yet unexplored realms of the hereafter. The religious man is not content with simply moral goodness. Unaided he can reason out a higher finish for the soul and its faculties than the merely negative state of sinlessness. Furthermore, the soul in him feels itself akin to a people of a finer life and a subtler activity. He is surrounded by an invisible world, out of which he recognizes that he has issued by his creation, and into which he is to return with his death; so that even in his subconscious moods he is counting upon his chances and his fortunes in that world of finalities. Far down in his soul, even when he fails or refuses to admit it, is the conviction that somehow his most substantial interests lie in the direction of the spirit land. He feels that all the problems of his existence are to find their solution in the study of the other world, that the true experience of God, that the only exact knowledge of his own destiny, that the proper comprehension of the Unseen is—such is the popular persuasion and error—to come to him through his intimacy with and his guidance by the invisible spirits about him.

TRUE MYSTICISM BASED UPON CATHOLIC DOGMA.

Man has always looked to religion to recognize, to cultivate and to perfect this mystic instinct of his nature. Hence in every vicissitude of man's religious life we discover the principles and the practice of the mystic life set forth as the sublimest scope of the theology he professes. But the development of man's mystic faculties by religion has not always been in harmony with reason and revelation. For there is a true mysticism and a false mysticism. Where it is not a mockery of religion, or a dallying with the supernatural, mysticism is wound up with religion and calls forth the exercise of the sublimest forces in man's religious propensities. Moreover,

mysticism takes after religion. Hence true mysticism postulates the true religion; that is to say, the Christian religion in its only true form, the teachings of the Catholic Church. And as to-day the non-Catholic world is slowly drifting towards atheism or occultism in the garb of some religious or scientific cult, it is more than merely opportune, it is even necessary, to set forth the doctrine and principles of this true mysticism often and in many ways. This is all the more called for just now because there exists so widespread an ignorance upon the relation of mysticism to religion in general, and especially touching the truth that the home of true mysticism is in the bosom of the Catholic Church; and because, secondly, the time seems to have arrived in modern religious decadence when this feature of Catholic teaching and practice should be more than hitherto insisted upon for the guidance and profit of earnest souls and for the confusion of evil-minded propagandists of the occult.

WHAT IS MYSTICISM?

Mysticism is almost as old as man himself. In its most ancient and fundamental sense it signifies initiation in mystery, and the initiated were termed mystics. Hence mysticism came to mean, as far back as the days of Clement of Alexandria, the possession of a wisdom unknown and foreign to the knowledge of the ordinary people. Conceived of in this generic sense, mysticism comprehends a twofold element. It is the outcome of an illumination superior to any intelligence vouchsafed to man on the ordinary level of human experience. It implies in the next place a spiritual activity begotten and nourished by a vitality whose source is loftier than that of the ordinary ascetic life of man. It is, therefore, an understanding and a life which is peculiar to the adept and denied to the multitude. In this broad sense every Catholic is in quite a true use of the term a mystic. He is by his baptism and the ministry of the word to him initiated in mysteries and truth not understood or possessed and realized by those outside the pale of Christian teaching. By his participation in the life of the sacraments, by his part in the august Sacrifice of the Mass and his union with the multitudinous prayer that goes up to God from the bosom of the Church, he puts forth an activity and leads a supernatural life which is impossible outside the "little flock of Christ." Yet this concept of the mystic, just because it is perhaps too broad, fails to exhibit the more exclusively accepted and orthodox notion of the Catholic mystic. For at every period of her existence the Church has been alive with men and women of a wisdom so lofty and with virtues of so extraordinary and heroic a character that the spiritual insight

and the supernatural habits to be found among the faithful at large are not at all comparable with them in nature or effect. These are the true Catholic mystics. Their state, their life is an extraordinary one. This privileged condition of the religious man—for I hesitate to describe it as an acquired habit—is an elevation of the soul above the influence of the senses and the sphere of the sensible world into an atmosphere of calm and contemplation approaching, at least remotely and in the sublime exercise of the nobler faculties, the state of angelic beings or the condition of incorporate spirits. In this state the soul leads a life closely united to God and is prepared in a privileged manner for the life of the beatific vision, that is to say, for that divine rapture which is to constitute the blessedness of our future existence. Catholic mysticism, accordingly, is far more than a mere persistence in the true faith, with an humble observance of the law of God, with confusion and sorrow and confession of sin, with participation in sacrifice and sacrament and with an abiding love of God and our neighbor—features which exhibit the best there is in the ordinary life of the Church and her children.

ITS ROOT LIES IN MAN'S DUAL NATURE.

Yet this extraordinary state of the soul is not an unnatural one. For mysticism of every kind is wound up with the dual nature of man; and while it deals with objects and experiences lying above and beyond the sphere of normal human activity, it does not in any instance call forth the play of forces the potentiality of which is not rooted in man's faculties. Man is a compound of matter and spirit. By their substantial union in him they *intrinsically* constitute him a unit agent; *extrinsically* they put him in relation with a threefold world—the world of matter beneath him, the world of men around him and the world of spirits and God above him. Accordingly his manner of acting is twofold—ordinary and extraordinary. Man's habitual, ordinary and simply natural activity is that of a rationally animated organism. As such the material element, his body, and the spiritual element, his soul, act simultaneously, not indeed as independent units, but interdependently as complementary forces of the same agent. His threefold relation, therefore, to nature, man and spirit is maintained and manifested not as body only, nor as mind only, but as he naturally and normally is and acts; that is, as a rationally animated body or organism. For the condition and fundamental basis of man's ordinary state is that in him as a person matter and mind or the rational soul exist, live, act and manifest themselves as a unit.

Man acts in an extraordinary manner whenever this unity is interrupted. For in so far as a man may be conceived as living exclusively as matter, or exclusively as spirit, that is, in so far as his life follows exclusively the laws which govern matter, such as the laws of inorganic bodies and plants and animals, or follows the laws which govern the soul and intelligent beings, he effects two changes in himself. He suspends his intercourse with the set of objects which correspond to one element of his nature and puts himself in direct communication with the objects of the other element in his nature. Thus, if he so disturbs the equilibrium of his life-forces as to make his corporeal faculties the source and medium of his vital activities, he thereby cuts himself off from the things of the soul and from the superior spirits around him; and to the extent that he pursues this separation, to that same extent does he identify himself with matter and render himself homogeneous with merely vegetable and animal propensities; to that same extent does he live as a simple product of nature, like a mere plant or animal. In the same way, if he cultivates the spirit-life only, he undermines the forces of activity of his body; he denies himself to the objects of the material element in him; and to the extent that he separates himself from the body and the things that are congenial to it he becomes identified with the life of the soul alone, and so homogeneous with its laws that he lives a life analogous to that of a spirit. Every such disturbance of man's duel activity and every displacement of the centre of his life-forces from their habitual unison, to the exclusive use of either his material or spiritual powers, puts him in an abnormal condition and makes his life and his manner of acting extraordinary.

But that which is extraordinary is not for that reason unnatural. For while it is perfectly natural that matter and spirit, which constitute the human person, mutually interpenetrate and act the one through the other, nevertheless human nature is such that the predominance of the one or the other of its substantial elements is entirely possible independently and exclusively of the other. Matter, notwithstanding its substantial union with spirit and the modifications which it receives from it, always remains what it essentially is, matter, and the spirit remains essentially spirit. Under these circumstances, therefore, the body of man can act as merely organized matter and the soul as merely independent spirit. So that the extraordinary in the mystic's life and actions is not that he goes counter to any law of his nature, but that he lives and acts differently from the habitual law of his nature. His condition is, therefore, an exception to the laws of his being, not a subversion of the essential order of things in himself and his faculties.

NATURE OF THE KNOWLEDGE POSSESSED BY THE MYSTIC.

Persons existing in any of these extraordinary states are in consequence possessed of a knowledge and realize experiences which are foreign to the uninitiated and beyond the reach of other men. The states themselves and the phenomena exhibited in them appear incomprehensible, and they are more or less inexplicable to those who have no experience in the mystical life. That a man see and describe things and events that exist entirely outside the field of his vision; that he hear sounds so far away that the ear cannot catch them; that he foretell future events and reveal the secrets of hearts is something inexplicable on merely natural grounds. For the rule is to see corporeal objects through the medium of the eye, to hear things with the ear, to know nothing of the future but what is revealed to us. These extraordinary powers are mystical powers, and those who are gifted with them are mystics or individuals in whom the faculties and forces act in a manner out of the ordinary and attain to their objects without following the beaten path of human activity. Naturally these powers are of many kinds, using the term mysticism in its largest sense. For on the one hand the sphere of man's activity is manifold; on the other, the phenomena of mysticism occur whenever any one of the elements or faculties of man's activity ceases to coöperate with the others or any one of his many forms of activity gets into direct and immediate intercourse with its object. Such combinations are fairly innumerable, and to each of them corresponds a form of mysticism. To enumerate them would be interminable. They are, however, capable of classification, and the result is a twofold mysticism—a mysticism whose object is God and a mysticism whose object is the creature. The latter, like the creature, is threefold—that whose object is nature, that whose object is man, that whose object are the invisible spirits around us. For outside of God there are three kingdoms of creatures: spiritual and invisible beings, visible and inorganic substances and organic natures. These constitute a link between the spiritual and the inorganic world.

OCCULTISM OR NATURAL MAGIC.

Man is preëminently the type and the representative of this last species of being. He unites in his composite nature the trinity of beings that goes to make up creation. He is accordingly by his constitution put in relation with all other beings, whether these are below him or above him in the order of creation. This relation can be and has been the basis of a threefold species of mysticism. In the first place, man can turn towards the nature beneath him and

give himself wholly to the study, service and worship of its forces, mysteries and phenomena. The outcome is natural mysticism. This was the mysticism of pagan antiquity. In the forms, grades and orgies of this mysticism—more correctly termed occultism—it is the inferior and organic nature in man which enters into intercourse with the divers realms of the world beneath him and which in virtue of the sympathy which renders them akin draws down with it the spiritual forces and superior faculties in his nature. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that this natural mysticism, however inferior to religious mysticism in its source and objects, is in itself and originally evil. Nature and its forces and its mysteries are the work of God, and in so far they cannot be evil in their relation to man. Yet there has been danger in this mysticism from the day that sin separated creation from God. The effects of the fall were felt even to the uttermost limits of physical nature, causing everywhere a profound division and conflict. Thenceforth a double principle invaded the universe; the one wholesome and conservative, the other malicious and direful. For this schism of the fall, primevally originating in the realm of spirits, inaugurated an irreconcilable war between the spirits of light, whose mission is order, harmony and beauty in external nature, and the spirits of darkness, who ever seek to create trouble, confusion and horror in the works of God. These two cities, the City of God and the City of Satan, exist everywhere and always, and man placed in the midst of their battles finds as well in the evil seeds which sin has deposited in his being as in the good which remains to him after the fall attractions which may and do solicit him in one direction as well as in the other, making him party to the powers of evil as well as a votary of the spirits which do the work of God in the world. In this dangerous alternative lies the evil and the risk to man of the cu't of and familiar intercourse with occultism or purely natural mysticism.

THE PHENOMENA OF SPIRITISM.

Besides this natural magic there is another and, in a way, a higher order of mysticism. It is and has often been called psychic mysticism. But among modern writers it is now, I believe, more usually known as spiritism, employing the term in its inclusive or widest sense. It is as much indeed a natural mysticism as magic, but because its source and its object are not simply the physical forces of matter it is distinguished from natural mysticism. Psychic mysticism has its subjective sources in the higher faculties or powers of man. It is largely an abuse of the nerves. In its practice it is true that the mind and especially the will of the medium are primarily acted upon or brought under mystic influence. But this extrinsic

influence reaches even the sensitive and inferior man, pervading his organic potencies and subserving the minutest and most intimate features of his nature to the determinations of this control. In many instances it even eliminates the individuality of the mind and will in favor of some foreign control. In this manner all man's psychic forces are penetrated with the result of this extraordinary influence—call it exaltation of soul, nervous excitation, sixth sense, extension of the psychologic faculties or even obsession—in virtue of which man's life for the time being is merged into a manifold intercourse with the threefold order of spirits—demons, dead men and angels. In this intercourse he comes to know things, to realize experiences, even to do things unknown to and impossible to the ordinary run of mortals. There are developed in him the diverse features of clairvoyance, mind reading, telepathy and the other numerous phenomena of magnetism, hypnotism and spiritism to be met with everywhere in the modern world of occultism.

DIVINE VS. DIABOLIC MYSTICISM.

Psychic mysticism, like natural mysticism, is essentially profane. It puts man in relation with creatures only. For this reason it is distinguished from religious or supernatural mysticism. Religious mysticism has God and the world of God's spirits for its object; and the religious mystic is one who lives in direct communion with God. For this reason religious mysticism is justly termed divine mysticism, while psychic and natural mysticism, perforce of their ready abuse by Satan, are called diabolic mysticism. The distinction is a just one, and is to be absolutely insisted upon where the mysticism of the true religion is in question. For all religions culminate or aim to culminate in mysticism. Mysticism is the highest expression of religion. But the mysticism of false religions is, as such, merely diabolic mysticism, for the same reasons that spiritism, or natural mysticism, are stigmatized as diabolic. Whatever is preternatural in them and attributable to the presence of intelligence, is simply commerce with the devil. For there is hardly a single form of profane mysticism, from the old pagan oracles to the manifestations of the ouija and to spirit rapping, that has not more or less frequently and definitely exhibited the presence of a malign intelligence. Besides, there exists all the difference in the world between the principles and works of these two mysticisms. Diabolic mysticism conducts man through an abuse of creatures and an unholy interpretation of the laws and mysteries of nature to a mystical union with the prince of darkness. Divine mysticism creates in man a contempt of the things that make him sin, detaches him from all that leads away from God and by a proper use of

creatures leads him upwards into a mystical union with the Lord of Light. In it the sublime truths of our faith are revealed to the soul under the divine light of revelation and through the teachings of the Church. The mysteries and hidden things of God are made clear to the mind of the Christian mystic. At the same time his will is strengthened with a heaven-descended force for the exertion of acts of heroic virtue, and often, too, for the utterance of prophecy and the working of most stupendous miracles. In diabolic mysticism the false light of the mind is the gloomy fire of hell. In it the votary of occultism never sees the true, the useful, the good and the beautiful. The Evil One is ever deceiving him with vain and futile knowledge, and the works he performs are but impostures and marvels that mimic only and challenge the works of God's saints and mystics. Thus while the graces vouchsafed to the divine mystic effect so extraordinary an abstinence and mortification in him that the very nature of his body seems to be altered and spiritualized, and ecstacies, bi-locations and the other phenomena that we so often meet with in the lives of the saints become almost connatural features of his activity; we see, on the other hand, in diabolic mysticism, and as it were offsetting these marvels, every sort of excess, diabolic raptures, aerial flights, distant manifestations and the countless other infernal phenomena that characterize the possessed or obsessed victims of satanic mysticism. For if, as it is true, divine mysticism tends to transform man into God and to liken him to the Divine Word, diabolic mysticism seeks to change man into a devil and liken him to Satan. The one specially prepares man for heaven, the other renders him particularly fit for hell.

THE DIVINE MYSTIC PASSIVE IN THE HANDS OF GOD.

Yet there is the widest difference in the process by which man is made a divine mystic and that by which he is perfected in the service of the devil. Diabolic mysticsm is from the beginning throughout a matter of man's own choice and work. He enters into this satanic intercourse by the simple invocation of the demon. He progresses in it by formal compact with or implicit surrender to the evil spirit, and he crowns the malice of his diabolic familiarities by such a gradual and entire surrender of himself to his malign master that he becomes in will, fancy, mind and often even in the powers and movements of his body so intimately one with the angel of darkness that eventually he is completely at the mercy and in the entire control of the devil. In divine mysticism, on the contrary, God, not man, is the principal, nay, the sole agent or active force. No man, whatever the merits of his sanctity, can initiate a life of mysticism in himself. The call to this life must come from

God alone. It is indeed in the power of the soul to prepare itself by the ascetic practices of the Christian life for this intimate communion with her divine Spouse; but she must passively await the moment when she will be introduced into the inner chamber of divine contemplation. The mystical life is, as we have said, inaugurated in the soul by the extraordinary grace of a call to this higher life. Once in it the soul is drawn further and further towards God until she is finally sublimated into a mystical union with Him. In consequence of this sublime union a radical change invades the whole being of the truly religious mystic. Whereas in satanic mysticism man seeks himself and in so far surrenders himself to the devil as to attain through him to some knowledge, experience or object beyond his native powers to reach, the true or divine mystic wholly loses himself in the immensity of God, living and acting only in God and for God. In the practice of the moral life, upon which the edifice of true mysticism must everywhere rest, the religious mystic has eradicated every iniquity from his soul. In the ascetic preparation for this life of union with God he has purified himself of even his legitimate affections, and finally in his mystical holocaust of himself he has consummated his sacrifice by handing himself over body and soul to Him from whom he has received all things. In return God works in him and through him those wonders which transcend the scope and powers of nature to accomplish. Not indeed that the life of the divine mystic consists essentially in visions, ecstacies, prophecies and other divine or extraordinary graces. These, when they are legitimate and authentic, are but signs and features of the mystical life. Eessentially this life is to be found in that extraordinary activity in the supernatural order which has its source in an extraordinary enlightenment and a singular force and excitation of soul coming into it, in a privileged manner, from God Himself. The mystical life is for this reason the nursery of Christian heroes. It is the garden of heroic virtues. These virtues do not, of course, differ from the ordinary Christian virtues in kind or even in appearance. Their exercise only is different. This is perfect in the mystic and extraordinary even in its perfection. For in the mystical life, more so by far than in the moral and ascetic life, the work of sanctification goes forward through extirpation and spiritual upbuilding. In it not only are the passions mortified, but they are plucked out by the very roots, and charity carried upwards to the heights of most extraordinary excellence. For as all the exercises of the ascetic life go to perfect charity, so, too, the mystic life inflames the heart of man with heroic charity and an intense love of divine union. The principle therefore of the mystic life, as it is of the ascetic life, is charity. In the

ascetic life this principle is some degree of perfect charity; in the mystic life this degree is heroic.

THE GIFT OF CONTEMPLATION AND ITS REWARD.

The source of this extraordinary charity, or rather the principal exercise by which God introduces the soul into the ways of the mystic life and through which He illumines and arouses her to the practice of the most exalted and heroic virtues, is the gift of infused prayer or contemplation. All things, therefore, in the mystical life come back to this sublime form of prayer, to this extraordinary insight into God and the things of God. For we distinguish a twofold knowledge and communion with God—the ordinary, in which God is the object of man's thoughts and the ultimate end of all his activities attainable through the natural or usual exercise of his rational faculties. This knowledge comes to man from the study of the works of God, from the dictates of reason and from the teachings of positive revelation. The other is extraordinary. It comes to man with the gift of infused prayer, through the immediate contemplation of God, in which the mystic's mind is illumined by an extraordinary divine light, which enables him to perceive divine truths with ease and affords him a deep insight into the hidden things of God. In this immediate contemplation of God, and in the life or actions which it animates, man is borne out of himself. He becomes rapt up into the thought, the idea, the vision of God thus vouchsafed to him. In its loftiest and most perfect expression this contemplative knowledge of God is ecstasy. For in ecstasy man ceases to live, to know, in the ordinary way. All his life seems to go into this single exercise of his illuminated mind. The other elements or forces of his being converge apparently towards this one act. They seem to vanish in favor of this one absorbing activity, in as much as the ways and means through which, in his ordinary life, communion with God was maintained are now, to all intents and purposes, suspended. His life, under the influence of this sublime knowledge of God, is all in God, of God and for God. This is the highest exercise of true mysticism and the source from which the marvelous works of the mystical life emanate in all their preternatural features.

MYSTICISM OUTSIDE OF CATHOLICITY.

It has been said that divine mysticism is possible only in the Catholic religion. This may not be absolutely true in individual instances and isolated acts. For on the one hand the immediate contemplation of God is radically or potentially congenital to the

highest development of man's intellectual forces. On the other hand, God can and may put Himself in immediate communication with any one of His creatures if He sees fit to do so for His own sublime ends. If, however, mysticism as a life or cult is ever possible outside the true Church, it must necessarily be a false or imperfect mysticism. For mysticism is necessarily of a piece with the doctrine of God, upon which it is based. If this is false, the mysticism to which it gives life is also false. If it is imperfect or piecemeal, the mysticism which is founded upon it is also imperfect and without consistency. For divine mysticism is not and cannot be a thing, a life, apart from religion. It is a species, an extraordinary form of the religious life. In its last analysis it is the union of man with God in knowledge and love. The truly divine mystic, therefore, is impossible in that religious life whose knowledge of God and whose habitual conscience is not founded on the true idea of God and upon the perfect expression of God's revelation. For God, however we may approach the study of Him, is the object of our religious life and is the same God whether we are in mediate or immediate communion with Him. Now God is not truly known except through the teachings of the Catholic Church, and in consequence Catholic mysticism is the only feature of the mystical life which is founded upon the true and complete knowledge of God. It is the only true mysticism. In fact, looked at in this correct way, divine mysticism is only possible within the pale of Catholicity.

In paganism there is no true union of God and man. Pagan mysticism is a refined Pantheism, in which God disappears in man, or man more frequently is transformed into God. The act of contemplation is an apotheosis of man through a concentration of all his mental forces upon a study of the hidden powers of his own being; or it is a self-annihilation of man, who is lost in the knowledge of the grandeur of the concept of God. There is never in paganism any real communing of one being with the other, and in consequence no true mysticism. In Judaism a true mysticism is impossible. In the Judaic dispensation a vast abyss stretched out between God and man—the abyss of the Incarnation. This abyss has never been bridged over and never will be traversed by the aspiration of the Jewish mystic. In his religion there was the mysticism of prophecy and the mystery of the Messianic promises; but never the only true and complete ground of divine mysticism—the assumption of human nature to the divinity in the fact of the Incarnation. The full revelation of God was wanting, and in consequence a true and complete union of God and man was impossible. Heresy is a parting of the seamless garment of Christ. It is a rejection of the authority of the Incarnate God and the exaltation

in its place of that pride of human reason which is so inimical not only to the perfect union of mysticism, but to the very lowest grades of divine charity. For there can be no approach to God where there is no Christian humility, no obedience to the authority of the God-man and no zeal for the integrity of His Holy Gospels. In the Catholic dispensation alone, therefore, we have a true, a perfect mysticism. In the teachings and practice of this union with God there is no apotheosis of man and no annihilation of the individual mystic. Yet the approach to God is closer and more complete than is conceivable in paganism. The duality of man and God, the distinction between the creature and the creator, is preserved, as against the pantheistic confusion of God and man in the mysticism of Greece and Rome or the occultism of modern India. On the other hand, the abyss separating God and man in Judaism is bridged over. God and man are united in the Incarnation, and the God-man is supernaturally made manifest to the world in the twofold revelation which He has left to the world in either Testament. There is no waiting for the fulfillment of prophecy or the realization of promises. The knowledge of God available to man is complete, and in as far as the dispensation of God with man is concerned is final in every detail. Moreover, this knowledge of God, so essential to the union of God with man, is guaranteed to us in its truth and entirety by the infallible *magisterium* which the God-man Himself founded among men unto the consummation of things for its propagation to the ends of time and space. It is a knowledge of God and of His blessed spirits, and of man, and of heaven, and of hell, and of the world of the hereafter, which is fixed and immune from change and error. It is in Catholicity therefore that we find the true knowledge of God, and therefore the complete union of God with man in divine mysticism.

THE MAN-GOD THE PERFECT EXPRESSION OF MYSTICISM.

As we have already intimated, the perfect expression of Catholic mysticism is in the Man-God; or, to express the same truth more consistently with the fact, Catholic mysticism is realized most perfectly in the Man-God. In the Incarnate Word we have in a single person the perfect likeness of man to God and the infinite difference between the human and divine nature. We possess in the hypostatic union the most immediate converse of man with God, and apart from the personality of the Word there is in Christ a duality of all things that go to make man and all the attributes that constitute God. Some writers on mysticism see in the Cross not simply the sign and symbol of Catholic mysticism, which we all see, but the root and the start of every mystic feature of Christianity. For

it is by the sign of the Cross, these writers claim, that Christ is the type and model of divine mysticism—in His doctrine, which purifies the soul; in His Passion, by which He conquered death, and in His triumph, which opened the way to heaven and God. Priest at once and victim, Christ by His sacrifice upon the altar of the Cross has left the impress of His double character upon the inmost recesses of His own being and transmitted it on to us in that mysticism which purifies the souls of men. This sign followed Him to the tomb. It rose with Him from the dead. It is the mark of those who are humble with Christ; it is the symbol of the elect. It followed Christ when He ascended into heaven, and will come with Him to judge the living and the dead. The Cross, then, is to do for every man and for the world what is done in Christ, the type and model of man and of creation—to mark all things for God. This theory of mysticism sees the impress of the Cross upon all things. It sees the boughs, branches, leaves and flowers of the plant world evolving after the type of the Cross. The bird in his flight, with head advanced, his wings extended, his feet and tail thrown back, suggests to it the figure of the Cross in the beings of the air. The swimming of the fish in the water, the prowling of the tiger in the jungle, the race of the camel across the sand plain, or the bounding of the stag from peak to peak upon the mountain heights are alive to these mystics with the thought of the Cross. Every existing substance, in the eyes of this mystic interpretation of symbolism, is but a reflex of the Cross. The central essence is the summit of the Cross. The outer accidents and multiple elements that go to integrate the substance suggest the shaft of the Cross. And the arms of the sacred emblem are represented by the bonds and forces which hold the elements in immovable union with their central and immovable essence. But above all in man is the mystic impress of the Cross seen clearly through every feature of his composition. In signing himself with the sign of the Cross, man touches as it were with the ends of the blessed emblem his head, the pit of his stomach, his left shoulder and then his right, finishing the sign with his hand upon his breast. The act is one accomplished in the will of man before it is made upon the body. It is made upon his soul and upon his body. It signs the head of man and all the organs it represents with the name of the Father. In the name of the Son it signs the heart and all the organic systems that minister to the life of man. His arms and hands, with the complicated muscular system which they represent, are signed in like manner in the name of the Holy Ghost. With the entire Cross man signs himself, body and soul, in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and in so doing he signs the

whole world with the great emblem of divine mysticism, inasmuch as the whole man is the reflex and epitome of the universe.

We must, however, observe of this pious conception of Catholic mysticism that while it is true that the Cross is in this wonderful manner wound up with every feature of Catholic mysticism, it is so only inasmuch as it is the symbol of Christ's work and the monument of His death. Christ's death is the great central event in the world's life which inaugurated the advent of true mysticism on earth, through the redemption, which was wrought out upon the altar of the Cross. It is thus the life-work of the Man-God which lends to the Cross its mystical force and efficacy. Accordingly it is in Christ that is accomplished the perfect union of God and man, and not in the symbolism of the Cross, except in so far as the Cross represents the merit and grace of union which comes to us through Christ. It is upon Christ, therefore, that the Christian is to build, if he would realize in himself in any degree the life which is to put him in immediate union with God. For the imitation of Christ is the starting point, as it must ultimately be the goal, of Catholic mysticism.

MYSTIC LIKENESS TO CHRIST POSSIBLE IN THE CHURCH.

Is this likeness to Christ, the Man-God, demanded by divine mysticism possible to men? Is this immediate union or intercourse with God so sublimely illustrated in Christ, and in which the terms to the relation are not destroyed but preserved in their original attributes possible to any and all the members of the Church of Christ? It is, provided there is the special call from God to this exalted union, and provided that the pursuit of this life is based upon the mystery of the Man-God. For that is possible which has been realized. The hypostatic union of God with man is not, of course, realizable in any other than Christ, but this union—the highest intercourse of man with God—being once and forever a fact in the relation of man with God, every inferior mystic union of God with man becomes, in virtue of this union, a possibility to all the followers of Christ. Yet whatever the degree of this mystical union of man with God, it is to be effected through the same divine medium that intervened in the Incarnation, the medium of the Holy Ghost. "And the angel answering said to her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And therefore the Holy One which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." The mystical union of man with God so sublimely, perfectly and substantially realized in the Man-God is to be effected in the members of the Church of Christ through the mediation of the Holy Ghost, not indeed in the

sublime, substantial manner in which it is realized in Christ, but imperfectly and extrinsically through the faculties and exercises which subserve the life of divine contemplation. The mysticism therefore realized in Christ is communicated to the faithful through the action of the Holy Ghost.

But this action of sanctification is not exerted directly and immediately upon the soul, but mediately and through the ministry of the Church. For Christ lives in the Church. The Church is Christ perpetuating Himself and His activity among men. In consequence of this indwelling of Christ in the Church, divine mysticism is realized in a permanent manner in the Church. The immediate and perfect union of man with God goes on forever in the Church. The faithful, in view of their participation of all the holy things of the Church, possess the power of ingrafting upon their own individual lives the mysticism realized in Christ. For the Church is the sum of the faithful, and each member of the faithful is a reflex of the Church. He is an image of the Church. He is an abridgement of the Church. And this relation of each member of the faithful to the Church exhibits and explains the manner in which under the special call of God each member of the Church can participate in the mysticism of Christ. However, it is to be observed that isolated and abridged parts of a whole are never exact copies of the whole, nor do they ever realize the perfection of the whole. There is a disparity between the whole and its component parts. There is therefore a difference in the way in which the mysticism which the Church inherits from Christ exists in the Church and the way in which it exists in the Man-God. And, secondly, there is a difference in the manner in which the mysticism which is permanent in the Church exists in the Church and the manner in which the same mysticism is realized in each member of the Church of Christ.

THE MYSTICAL LIFE IN CHRIST AND IN THE CHURCH.

In Christ the mystical life is an undivided activity. In Him all the functions of the mystical life constitute a unit force. Christ is at one and the same time Prophet, Priest and King, and jurisdiction, worship and doctrine are in Him not three distinct phases of the mystical union of man with God in Christ, but these three functions are one and the same mystical union itself and the very reality which constitutes the mysticism of Christ. But that which exists in Christ as a unit and as an undivided force or life exists in the Church in a multiple and a divided manner. The unit mysticism of Christ is exhibited and evolved in the Church through a threefold principle of development. For the Church is not the personal

God-Man, and she does not reveal her humano-divine nature to the world except through the medium of her representative actions. These actions are mainly three, and they correspond on the one hand with the threefold function of Christ, her Founder, and on the other with the threefold character of her divine mission. Of these actions the preaching of the Church constitutes the fundamental basis of all legitimate mysticism. This action of the Church corresponds to the prophetic or teaching function of Christ. Through the voice of the Church God shows Himself in search of an intimacy with man in this vale of his burdens. "Come to me all you who are burdened and I will refresh you." Through the message of His Gospel God over and over again repeats and emphasizes His love for man. "Greater love," He says, "than this no man has, that a man lay down his life for his friends." And again: "If any one love me he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him, and we will make our abode with him."

In a word, in the doctrine of the Church is set forth the principle, law and practice of that sublime life which is to bring God and man together on this earth in the most intimate union—the principle, the law and the practice of the life of Christ, who said of Himself: "I am the way, the truth and the life." "I am the vine, you are the branches; the same beareth much fruit, for without me you can do nothing." Next to the great doctrinal function of the Church, in virtue of which man is united to God in his mind, memory and will, the three directive powers of his spiritual existence, the sacerdotal function of Christ is perpetuated in the ubiquitous life of divine worship in the Church. In the exercise of this sublime act of divine worship in the Church, God and the members of God's Church are put and preserved in an intimate union one with the other. It is, moreover, a threefold union. For it is a sacramental union, in which, through the fountain of divine grace that flows into the Church through the sevenfold channel of the sacraments, God lives and acts in the souls of men. It is a sacrificial union. In the Mass, the sacrifice which exists everywhere in the Church from the rising to the setting of the sun, man and God are united and mutually react, the one upon the other, as Victim and Sacrificer, as Ransom and Captive, as Food and Body, as Priest and Most High God. It is the union of prayer. For in the prayer that is going up to God everywhere in the Church, and in the spirit of meditation with which the Church in the lives of so many of her children is ever occupied with the things of God, the faithful live in God and act in Him through the spirit and virtue of faith, hope, charity and cleansing sorrow. But besides the prophetic and sacer-

dotal function of Christ thus perpetuated in the Church, the royal prerogative of the Man-God is continued and exercised through the discipline and manifold form of jurisdiction by which the Church governs and conducts the faithful to the goal of that perfection to which their baptism has ordained each one, and by which she realizes the will of her Divine Founder in the multitude, character and perfection of her external life and works. Now it is in this sum of the Church's life and action, it is in this threefold principle of supernatural or spiritual development by which the Church accomplishes the work of man's sanctification that we find revealed the extent of the immediate union between God and man in the Church. They constitute so many degrees in the mystical life of the Church, rising one above the other, in the order of an excellence in which the exercises of the royal function of Christ in the Church is superior to the prophetic mission of the Church, and in which the sacerdotal function, especially in the august Sacrifice of the Mass, exhibits the most sacred and stupendous features of Catholic mysticism. For it is in the most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass that divine mysticism attains to the highest possible degree of mystery and development in the Church.

HOW THE MYSTICAL LIFE OF CHRIST AND THE CHURCH IS INGRAFTED UPON THE INDIVIDUAL LIVES OF THE FAITHFUL.

It remains now to be seen how this mysticism of Christ, perpetuated and developed in the Church by the triple function of preaching, discipline and worship, is ingrafted upon the individual lives of the faithful. To begin with, man is, as we have said, a member of the Church in which the mysticism of Christ is perpetuated. As such he participates in his right of a Catholic in this mysticism of Christ. That is to say, each member of the Church, for just the reason that he is a member of Christ's Church, possesses some degree of union and intimacy with God. Yet this mystical life, which comes to each one of the faithful in virtue of his union with the Church, is not reproduced in him either in its reality or in its work, equally and in the same absolute manner that it is perpetuated in the Church. Nor is the reason of this hard to find. For although the individual man is a member of the body which we call the Church, he is at the same time, when placed face to face with the Church, partially or inadequately distinct from the Church. The Church is something outside of him, and therefore objective to him. In like manner the threefold work or mystic function of the Church is not a feature of himself, but a life and activity outside of himself. It is for him and to him a subject of knowledge and of study. It is a spiritual life to be assimilated. It is a substance

which it is in his power to appropriate. It is a rule of life. It is a model, a means, a principle by which he is to shape his own religious existence. This each member of the Church realizes and makes the basis of his relations and attitude towards the threefold function of mystical development in the Church. Hence it is that in every member of the faithful a threefold practice or conformity exists corresponding to the three features of the Church's life and work. In each one of the faithful there exists the virtue and practice of faith, a condition which corresponds to the teaching office of the Church, and through which the faithful ingraft upon their lives and conduct the principles and doctrine of Christ as taught to them by the Church. In each member of the Church there also flourishes the spirit and practice of religion or divine worship as exhibited in the participation of the sacraments, the oblation of daily sacrifice and the diverse exercise of prayer, meditation and contemplation. In each dutiful child of the Church we find a deep-seated solicitude for the fulfillment of the whole law and for the realization of the will of God in all the interior and exterior works of his earthly life, a realization and a solicitude which correspond and are in every detail of Christian duty proportioned to the disciplinary office of the Church and to her royal prerogative of universal jurisdiction.

Still the Catholic man or woman is not a mystic in the exact sense of the word, simply because as a member of the Church he puts on the mysticism of the Church. To a certain extent he is, even in this view, a truly mystical person. He comes before us as a person in immediate intercourse with his God. His activity as a member of the Church emanates, through divine grace, immediately from God in a very true sense. His works are done in God and for God; for "As the Father raises up the dead and giveth life, so the Son also giveth life to whom He will." Yet man takes on this mystical character only in as far as the Church is individualized in him, and we see in him and in any act of his the Church herself and some one or other feature of the manifold activity which is permanently emanating from her divine life. He is a mystic in this sense because he is of the mystical body of Christ. But when we consider any member of the Church in himself and for himself, and look upon his actions as actions proceeding from an individual, independent agent, he is a mystic in his own individual character, and his mystical life will take on the personal features given to it by the traits of his individual nature under the disposition of the special perfection imparted to it by divine grace. It is true that his personal intercourse with God is still realized through the Church, and that his works have God immediately in view for the

reason that he lives in the Church, and that he participates of the life of the Church. But in his individual as opposed to his corporate, mystical character, he participates in this life as something objective to himself. He participates in it as a doctrine to which he assents and which he follows as a light; as a worship in which he participates as the highest duty of his existence; as a discipline to which he submits as the surest law of sanctity. In this way the mystical life that is realized in him is his own mystical life. It is begotten in him by various means and in various degrees. Its basis is faith, which comes to him by hearing the word of God. Its exercise is worship, the sacraments, prayer. Its safeguard is obedience to the authority of the Church. Its postulate is the moral law. Its immediate preparation is the ascetic life. Its fulfillment is the manifold perfection of the contemplative life. When this life of contemplation has been realized, Catholic mysticism is the result. And that member of the Church in whose existence the works and practice of the life of contemplation are exhibited to that degree of perfection which we venerate in the lives of many of the saints, affords us an example of the genuine Catholic mystic. For such a one is extraordinary in the intimacy of his union with God and often, too, most wonderful in the preternatural character of his works.

THE MYSTIC LIFE BASED UPON THE ORDINARY CHRISTIAN LIFE.

It stands to reason, however, that no member of the Church can ever attain to the perfection of this life of the Catholic mystic, whose mysticism is not based upon the excellence of the ordinary Christian life. There is no such thing as a Catholic mystic in whom there is not a perfect devotion to all the teachings of faith, an exceptionally devout use of the sacraments, great zeal for divine worship, an uninterrupted practice of prayer and the fulfillment of the whole law of Christ. For faith is not judged by visions, but the character of visions is determined by the infallible truth of faith. The marvels wrought at the touch or at the prayer of the sublimest mystic will never constitute a criterion of morality; but the moral character as well of his works as of the mystic himself is to be ever judged by the unimpeachable data of the Church's moral and ascetic law. Not indeed that it is impossible or that in very many instances much light has not come into the Church through the words and works of her mystical favorites, nor that we do not possess from these same sources moral and dogmatic information which we could ill do without, but because a mystical career in the Catholic Church is not gauged so much by the marvels and revelations which distinguish it as by the holiness of

life underlying it. For man attains to the mystic state through a complete abnegation of himself, through the cultivation of retirement, by fasting, by a general trampling under foot of the desires of the flesh. But more especially does he attain to this state by the practice of humility, penance and mortification. Mortification in the sense of a progressive purgation of the soul from the dross of inordinate affections is absolutely necessary to the mystic life. It is a preparation for this life and it is a result of it. The soul in the hands of God is more and more disposed for newer and greater graces by the purification which it receives through the practice of mortification. These added graces in their turn induce a loftier spirit and a more cleansing labor of mortification. So that the further a mystic advances towards the spirit world the further he recedes from the material world and becomes alienated even from himself. The higher, therefore, the mystic is raised by the practice of contemplation up towards God, the more he is alienated by the purging force of his mortification from all things and even from himself until, finally, dead to himself, he lives united to God alone in that sublime intercourse to which the mystic writers have given the name of spiritual marriage.

TRUE MYSTICISM FOUNDED IN ABNEGATION.

This sublime form of Christian abnegation we find exercised under divers forms and in many degrees in the history of Catholic mysticism. These in turn depend upon many and various causes. Individual character, the circumstances of the mystic's life, the spirit of the times, the influence of public events, in a word, the destiny of each particular mystic will largely influence his spirit and his practice of abnegation. Hence no two mystics are alike. No two ages of mysticism in the Church are alike. Yet divine mysticism at every period in the Church's life is built, as upon its only foundations, upon this purification or purgation of the soul. This purification is twofold, active and passive, and both the one and the other is requisite for the life of divine contemplation. For as precious ointment, to use the language of the mystical writers, is not poured into unclean vessels, so, too, heavenly consolation, that celestial balsam of the soul, is not poured into a soul defiled by sin or unfit for an intimate union with God by reason of the multitude of its defects. Everything must be removed that might displease the divine Spouse of the soul. The first labor, therefore, of the mystic is to pluck out of his heart every inordinate affection or esteem for country, relatives, friends, pleasures, pastimes, conveniences, riches, means, dignities, honors and to convert the same into a veritable hatred of all these things. By a constant internal

and external mortification he must aim to eradicate all his passions and perverse inclinations. By retirement and a strict custody over his senses he must study to preserve himself in an internal and external solitude, in which alone God will speak to his soul. All these pious endeavors—holy mortifications, devout arts and spiritual solicitudes—by which the soul strives with the aid of God's grace to reform her mind, her body, her heart and her whole sensitive appetite, and thus render herself fit for the contemplation of heavenly things, is the first or active purgation or purification of the soul required for the life of contemplation. It is so necessary to the mystical life that without it there is no immediate union with God through divine contemplation possible in any degree whatever.

But alone this active purgation is insufficient. Over and above the soul's active efforts at fitting herself for a life of contemplation there must be the work of God Himself in the soul, further disposing it for this intimate union of the spiritual life. This work is effected by what the mystical theologians term the passive purgation of the soul. This passive purgation of the soul consists in the complex mass of those awful drynesses, fearful temptations and other internal and external tribulations which God in the exercise of His peculiar providence over mystic souls sends upon those whom He has destined for this exalted state, in order that by this violent ordeal the rebellious appetites may be subjected to the perfect control of reason, and that vicious and imperfect habits may be so completely corrected that the soul is eventually toned and tempered to the sublime action of celestial contemplation. For as the imperfect soul, before it is admitted to the beatific vision, must pass through the flames of Purgatory that it may be purged from the slightest dross, so, too, must the soul of the mystic pass through these passive purifications before it is capable of enjoying the contemplative vision of God. As Chancellor Gerson describes it, this purgation of the soul is "a whetstone that sharpens the iron. It is the absinthe which weans the child from the breast. It is the hammer which enlarges and broadens. It is the file which smooths, cleanses, brightens. It is the furnace in which the gold is refined until it glitters." And this passive purgation or refining of the soul is twofold, a purifying of the senses and a purifying of the spirit. The former is the sum of those sensitive afflictions which by subduing the sensitive appetite and reducing it to the servitude of the spirit produce that peace and quiet in which the soul of the mystic is raised gently, sweetly, gradually up to the contemplation of God. The latter is the sum of those spiritual trials which by rendering the soul as nearly like God as human frailty will permit beget that detachment and purity which dispose

the soul to the union of divine converse and to her transformation into God through the exercise of the contemplative life. In this purgative preparation and the consequent union of the soul with God we possess the perfect expression of divine, of Catholic mysticism. For the substantial definition of this life is such a union of man with God that the soul, so to speak, feels, touches His presence in her. This experimental sense of the presence of God, to use the phraseology of the mystical doctors, produces in its turn an ineffable joy in the soul which may be, and often is, accompanied by the external phenomena of ecstasies, raptures, visions, prophecies and miracles, although the possession of these preternatural powers is not to be confounded with the mystic life itself, inasmuch as it is separable from it and does not always accompany it.

JAMES J. CONWAY, S. J.

St. Louis, Mo.

THE LEGEND OF ST. OLAF, OF NORWAY.

OLAF,[1] Crassus as he was nicknamed, the bold Viking called by Carlyle "the Christian Reform King," because of his zeal for Christianity, the patron saint of Norway, was never formally canonized, though he is mentioned in the Roman Martyrology on July 29, the day of his death.

He was the son of Harold Guenlandus, King of Norway, and Asta, daughter of Gudbrand, and was born in 995, shortly after his father's death. Harold, though the father of a saint, was by no means a saint himself. After his marriage with Asta, who appears to have been beneath him in rank, he fell in love with the young and beautiful Sigrida, Empress of Sweden and daughter of Tosti, with whom Harold stayed five winters. By some writers Sigrida is said to have been Harold's foster-sister. However this may have been, Harold became deeply enamored of her, and begged her on one occasion to marry him in spite of Asta being alive. The scene took place on horseback, and Sigrida told him indignantly that he already had one wife, Asta, who although not his equal in birth, was the best wife for him, and having thus delivered herself she rode away from her disconsolate lover.

Harold persisted in his suit and followed her, but fell a victim to his unlawful passion, for Sigrida, determined to get rid of him,

[1] This account of St. Olaf, unless otherwise stated, is taken from the "Scripta Historica Islandarum," a Latin translation of the Islandic Saga.

ordered the house in which he and Vivaldus, another King whom he had met, were sleeping, to be set on fire, and as they tried to escape they were slain.

Harold had a friend named Ranius, who was not in Sweden at the time, but we are told that news traveled very quickly in those days, and he soon heard of his sovereign's murder and broke the news to Asta, who seems to have been more concerned at her husband's infidelity than at his death, for she returned very angry to her father's house.

It appears that some time before this Ranius had a dream, in which a former King, Olaf Geierstaid, appeared to him and told him to open his tomb and take out of it his sword, Besingus, his mantle, ring and girdle, and when the child Asta was expecting was about to be born to give her the girdle; and the child was to be called Olaf and to have the sword. The apparition warned Ranius not to be afraid to perform this ghastly task, for if he were, great trouble would come to him; on the other hand, if he did it, the child would live to be a great King. Ranius thereupon plucked up his courage and opened the coffin and took out the mantle, ring, sword and girdle. Then when Asta was taken ill he gave her the girdle to wear, and as soon as the child was born sprinkled him with water, after the heathen custom then in vogue, and named him Olaf.

Gudbrand, the boy's grandfather, was at first unwilling to bring him up because of the odium Harold had incurred by his affair with Sigrida, but when Ranius declared he had seen a light shining over the house when the child was born, he consented to keep him, and eventually brought him up with love and care.

Many anecdotes are given in the Icelandic Saga, from which this account of him is derived, of Olaf's youthful precocity, and as they throw also a light on the manners and customs of the age, and are considered reliable, we shall relate the most striking of them.

When Olaf was about six years old Asta, his mother, had two suitors. One was Sigurdus Porca, King of the Ringariki, and the other a prefect named Gissur. Asta, who does not seem to have cared inordinately for either, took the child on her lap one day and asked him which of the two she should choose. At first Olaf said the one who smiled most when he played with little children; but when Asta told him she was sure he could answer better than that, he displayed more sagacity and asked a pertinent question, namely, was his mother ambitious?

Asta replied that "she is not wanting in ambition," and the boy then asked if she would rather have a son a prefect or a King of Norway, for Ranius had taught him that only those of royal birth

can ascend the Norwegian throne. And finally it was decided that Asta should marry Sigurd, and the marriage turned out a very happy one apparently, from the glimpses we get of their married life.

Olaf was still quite a child when Olaf Trignesson, who had succeeded his father Harold on the throne of Norway, came to stay with Sigurd at Ringarikum. Now Olaf Trignesson was not only an excellent King, but he was also a Christian and had introduced Christianity into Norway and other lands and converted most of his subjects. While at Ringarikum he baptized Sigurd, Asta, Olaf and all the household and stood godfather to Olaf.

When Olaf was about eight he one day saw something bright shining in a box and asked his mother what it was. She told him it was the sword Besingus which Ranius had given him at his birth. Childlike Olaf asked to have it, and Asta rather foolishly gave it to him, whereupon the boy began to play with it. Presently Sigurd, who was a very domestic man and of an economical disposition, came in and was annoyed to see this sword, which we are told was a very handsome one and much decorated, trailing on the ground after the child. He blamed Asta and told her it was exactly like a woman to indulge a child in things it wants least and refuse it things it really wants. Wherefrom we gather that Sigurdus Porca entertained no very high opinion of the wisdom of women, and moreover was a very shrewd man. Asta answers that if Sigurd can take away the sword without making the child cry he can do so, but she won't have the boy cry. Sigurd temporizes, and asks if Olaf will give him Besingus in exchange for a lighter sword. Olaf is silent. Sigurd repeats his question. Olaf remains silent. Sigurd asks a third time, and the boy still refusing to speak, he not unnaturally gets impatient, and is about to force him to give up Besingus, when Olaf draws the sword, throws the shield to Ranius, and stretching out the point of the sword to the King, said:

"I am not of an age to prohibit, but I invite you to snatch Besingus from me, for I give it to no one unless I retain the shield and the handle." Upon which Sigurd tells him to keep the sword, as it would not have been easy to compel him to give it up.

The delightfully natural touches in the description of this little domestic scene vouch for its truth. We can see the fond mother who won't have her boy made to cry, the sensible stepfather and the high-spirited but precocious child. The Saga gives another anecdote of Olaf's youth which is generally quoted by all his biographers, though it seems to us to have less point in it than the sword story. It seems that Sigurd, who was very rich and also very prudent, acted as his own steward and farmed his lands and

overlooked everything himself, King though he was. One day he wished to ride, and no one at home being unoccupied, he ordered Olaf to saddle his horse for him. When the horse ought to have been ready Sigurd went out and blamed Olaf because he ought to have saddled the horse, and said "it was clear he was willing to refuse commands that did not please him, and it appeared they were unlike in disposition, and that Olaf was of a more vehement nature than he." Olaf said little, but went out and saddled a goat for the King.

Another time when Olaf was ten Sigurd invited a number of guests to a feast, and told his stepson to see that the necessary things were prepared. Olaf ordered[2] some sheep to be killed and invited double the number of guests Sigurd had commanded, and when the King remonstrated with him he answered "that Kings ought to live otherwise than vile peasants," from which stories we gather the boy had a great idea of his own dignity and very regal notions on the duty of hospitality.

It is said that in his youth the boy was beautiful in face. He was of middle size, not tall; stout and thick-set; hence his nickname of Crassus. His limbs were compact and robust; his hair was chestnut, his face broad and rosy; his eyes were wonderful, clear and beautiful, and when angry he was formidable to look at. He was for the days in which he lived very accomplished. He was a dexterous archer, a good swimmer, a fine speaker; his judgment was excellent, his observation acute; he did everything quickly and wished for his dignity's sake to be first in all games of skill. He was beloved by his friends and relations.

When he was twelve years old he went on board a man-of-war for the first time, his mother deputing Ranius, who had had much experience in piracy, to take charge of him. We are told that even in this first expedition, though Ranius sat at the helm, Olaf commanded the ship and the sailors called him King. This was the beginning of Olaf's wild life of a Viking. He went first to Denmark, and in the autumn invaded Sweden. He wintered in Gothland and imposed tribute on the people. Then he laid waste Finland, fought in Friesland, Sudoika and the Island of Oeset, and the following autumn went to England, where he took part in battles with the Danes and Anglo-Saxons.

He spent several years in England. He was present at the battle of Kingmer in 1010 and at the storming of Canterbury in 1012, and he took part with King Ethelred in many battles against the Vikings. In the autumn of the year he first visited England King Sweyn was found dead in his bed, whereupon Ethelred, who was

[2] The Saga says "a family of sheep."

in Flanders, immediately returned to England, and it was then that Olaf assisted him in a war against Denmark and remained with him three years as commander of the English army till 1012, when Ethelred died. Olaf then went to Normandy, and from thence to Gibraltar, where he had a vision, in which "a man of angelic and formidable presence appeared to him and told him to return to Norway and he should be King there forever." Olaf took this to mean that he and his posterity should occupy the Norwegian throne, and instead of going further, he obeyed the command and returned to Norway, and from this time appears to have abandoned his wild piratical life and devoted himself to extirpating heresy and paganism and establishing Christianity in his kingdom.

Before we proceed to the very interesting account given in the Saga of his return to Norway we will quote some of the legends of his career as a Viking. When he was near the Baltic Sea his companions heard there was a certain prophetess in the place whom they desired to consult, so they asked Olaf if they might question her about his fortune. He said, "No." They then asked if they might question her in his name. This time he did not refuse permission, though he did not wish them to do it. So they consulted her and asked her how long he would be victorious, or if his death was near? She replied, "she saw rays of terror standnig above him, against which it was not granted her to look;" but she added: "Tell the King the day he falls in word in life, that same day his life will be laid down."

Another time when in England Olaf is said to have visited a hermit, whose name is unfortunately not given, who prophesied that he would occupy the Norwegian throne and wear the martyr's crown, both of which prophesies were, as we shall see, in a certain way fulfilled.

Once when fighting some pagans, after he had conquered many and taken a great deal of plunder, the soldiers on bringing the spoils to the ship sought the King, but could not find him. The whole army was in great grief at his loss and did not know what to do. While they were pondering over what steps to take to find him, they saw him dismounted on the ground and a number of men bearing heavy burdens on their backs pleading before him. When the soldiers had carried all these men to the ship and got them on board, they asked them why they, who were so many, suffered themselves to be taken prisoners by one man? The prisoners answered "that Olaf was not alone; they saw with him a great number of armed men, who forced them to bear these heavy burdens." The soldiers, knowing that the King was alone, won-

dered exceedingly, and from that time venerated Olaf with great praise.

Many tales are told of Olaf's adventures with his sword Besingus. On one occasion he was left alone on shore, when he heard a fearful noise from some trees, and presently an enormous wild boar appeared, "followed by such a number of boars that the place seemed filled with them." The big boar attacked Olaf, who was on horseback, but he drew both of his feet up onto his saddle. The boar put its muzzle on to the cloth with which the saddle was covered, and the King swung Besingus and cut off the boar's muzzle below the eyes. The boar still contrived to roar, making a greater noise than Olaf ever heard, but finally succumbed, and Olaf took his muzzle and teeth as a trophy. History is silent as to the part played by the other wild boars in this scene. Perhaps they ran away, or were the offspring of the King's imagination; but that he killed one with Besingus in the way described is most probable.

As Olaf landed in Norway he fell and remarked: "The King falls." "No," said Ranius, "he does not fall; he sets his foot firmly in the soil," and Olaf laughed and took it as a good omen. He went home first to his mother Asta and his stepfather Sigurd at Ringarikum, and Asta's preparations for receiving her son with due honor, after his long absence and victorious career, are very naïvely described. She commanded all her servants, men and women, to set the house in the best order and divided the tasks among them in couples. Two were set to strew the floors with fresh straw, for there were no carpets in Europe in those days; two were sent to place the wine bowls on the sideboard, two to set the table, two to place dishes upon it, two to fetch beer from the cellar; two were sent to Sigurd, who when the news of Olaf's coming arrived was out in the fields. These two carried him royal apparel and a saddle inlaid with gold and a bridle set with precious stones, that he might be suitably appareled, according to Asta's ideas, to do honor to her son. We are expressly told she was a liberal, large-minded woman, and we gather incidentally that she was exceedingly proud of Olaf and very ambitious for him, and certainly did not intend Sigurd to receive him in his every-day clothes. The Saga describes Sigurd's dress as he appeared to meet his stepson. He wore a blue tunic, blue stockings reaching high up his thighs, a wide mantle of bluish gray fur; in his hand he carried a stick upright with a large silver ring on the top, which seems to have been doing duty for a sceptre.

During Olaf's stay at Ringarikum Sigurd, whose economy constantly peeps out, gave Olaf's soldiers milk and beer on alternate

days. This did not please the men, and they complained to Olaf, who told them Sigurd did it out of prudence, because milk was better than beer for wounded men. On the feast of Jolensus a banquet appears to have been given in Olaf's honor, and his mother placed him on a splendid high throne, and when Sigurd entered with his court in gala dress, a scarlet mantle covering him, he saluted his stepson lovingly and invited him to stay with him as long as he liked. He then sat next him, and they talked and took wine together and were very happy. Presently Asta brought in her baby, Sigurd's son, and put him on to Olaf's lap and asked him "whether he saw any talent hidden in the child." Olaf replied cautiously "that if the infant was permitted to live his life would not be a foolish one." This child was Harold, afterwards King of Norway.

Sigurd at first was not inclined to help Olaf to be King, and prophesied opposition from the Danish and Swedish Kings, which prophecy in the sequel proved true; but Asta took Olaf's part so warmly that Sigurd withdrew his opposition, and Olaf was proclaimed King, first of part of Norway, eventually, in 1014, of the whole country.

There seems to be some doubt about the date of Olaf's visit to Canute in England, but apparently it took place before this return to Norway, according to the Saga, which says Canute invaded England in 1012, and that Ranius was sent by Olaf to bribe the people to receive him, and that the next winter he himself landed in Northumberland and remained in England till he went to Normandy. Maurer says that when Canute was in England, in 1013-1014, Olaf was Ethelred's servant and Canute's enemy, and that therefore he could not have stayed with him then; but the Saga places Ethelred's death in 1012, so it seems most likely it was after that date that Olaf remained as Canute's guest till he went to Normandy.

Canute, afterwards his enemy, appears from several anecdotes always to have been jealous of Olaf and to have envied him. It was Olaf's custom to go to Mass when the bell summoned the people, and to be present till the end of the service; and the Saga quaintly adds: "No matter how much noise nor what disturbance went on outside the church, Olaf never looked out, but persevered in prayer, nothing moved by fear." But when Canute assisted at Mass it was his custom that they should wait for his coming before beginning, and he seems to have had no scruples about delaying the service.

On a certain feast day Canute was expected, and after they had been waiting for him a long time the Bishop, seeing Olaf in church,

blamed Canute and said: "In the evening King Canute will come, but we shall wait no longer for him, for this King Olaf is now here, who is of pure soul and loves the Divine Office." When Canute arrived and heard what the Bishop had said he was angry and envied Olaf and, in the words of the Saga, "could not look at him with straight eyes." He told the Bishop, who is believed to have called Olaf King for the first time, by a supernatural instinct, that Olaf had no kingdom and was no better than he was and no stricter in food and dress. The Bishop replied that Olaf wore haircloth under his beautiful clothes and drank water when Canute thought he was drinking wine.[3]

That Olaf was strict with himself is proved by another incident. He is said to have been cutting wood one Sunday, forgetting what the day was, and when reminded he burnt the shavings on his bare hand to punish himself.

He had many enemies, among them one Rerekus, King of Uppland, whom some writers say Olaf had blinded because of his heresy, for he was very severe in putting down heresy and paganism. At any rate Rerekus was blind, and several times attempted to kill Olaf. Once on Ascension day during Mass, both Kings being present, the Bishop having conducted Olaf with great pomp round the church to his seat in the north part of the choir, Kerekus, who was sitting by the King, took hold of his arm, pressing the armpit to find out if he had on a coat-of-mail, and remarked that he was wearing silk, and inquired why he did so. Olaf replied that it was the feast of the Ascension of Our Lord. When Mass began Olaf stood up and holding his hand over his eyes bowed towards the altar so that his toga was thrown back from his shoulders. Suddenly Rerekus pierced him with a dagger, but though he cut his clothes he did not wound him, the folds of his toga saving him. As he felt the iron seeking him he threw himself on the ground and Rerekus struck again, but failing to wound his enemy thought the King had fled and said: "Thou fleest from the blind, Olaf Crassus." Olaf commanded his followers to take Rerekus out of the church. They obeyed and afterwards begged Olaf to put Rerekus to death for his treacherous conduct. Olaf refused to put do this, but he sent Rerekus to Iceland, where three years later he died and was buried and is the only King buried in that island.

In 1018 Olaf's stepfather, Sigurd Porca, died, and about this time Olaf was betrothed to Ingigerda, daughter of another Olaf, King of Sweden. The two Olafs had been fighting for some time, and though it was not a regular war, there had been many skirmishes between them, and when Olaf Crassus offered to make peace

[3] Mauser's "Bekehrung der Norwegischen Stammen."

with him the Swedish Olaf promised to give him his daughter Ingigerda in marriage.

At the appointed time Olaf Crassus set out to the place fixed upon to celebrate the marriage, but on arrival found no bride, no King Olaf to meet him and no legates. Our Olaf spent a great part of the summer in Sweden and sent to know the meaning of this conduct, and eventually discovered that the King of Sweden had broken his promise and given his daughter to Jarostad, King of Russia, instead. Ingigerda, it seems, was very anxious to marry Olaf, but her father told her nothing would induce him to consent to her marriage with Olaf Crassus, whose nickname displeased him and who had conquered him in their recent quarrel.

Olaf Crassus was naturally very angry at this breach of faith, and was going to war with Sweden, when Bognavaldus, Prince of Gotha, suggested that Olaf should marry Astrida, the Swedish King's illegitimate daughter, instead, and brought her to Norway for Olaf to see. There were several interviews and long colloquies between the pair, but Olaf was very obstinate, and for a long time refused to be put off with Astrida, when he had been promised Ingigerda. At last Astrida, who appears to have been a very capable young woman, tells him it is wrong to make war for Ingigerda when he can have her without any fighting, and in the end Olaf yields and is married to Astrida in 1019.

After his marriage he appears to have labored more assiduously than ever for the Church, and introduced Christianity into many provinces. He was most zealous in propagating the faith, and is said to have used very drastic methods of conversion, and to have stamped out heathenism with great severity. The people whom Olaf Trignesson had originally converted were constantly reverting to paganism, and this Olaf Crassus punished with great strictness; but his one thought was the glory of God and the spread of Christianity. He often checked his own will to do God's will, and he cared more for God's will than for the opinion of good men or for his position with his people.

Maurer says that "as long as he lived there were different reports about him. Some said he was obstinate, haughty, mean, revengeful, avaricious, passionate and a man of the world. Others who knew better called him gentle, humble, kind, of a good disposition, mild, good humored, wise; a good friend, faithful and true, generous, modest, silent, one who always kept his word and was obedient to God's laws. And these were right." This testimony from Maurer, who is inclined to belittle Olaf, is more valuable than the praises of the sagas and scalds, for the very reason that the German historian is disposed to dispute his claims to sanctity, in estimating

which we must remember the rough time in which he lived and the wild piratical life the old Vikings led.

However, there seems little doubt that, as Maurer says, Olaf's subjects, rich and poor, were disaffected mostly because of his strictness and severity in putting down heresy and idolatry, so that when Canute came to Norway to set Hakon Ericson on the throne and Hardicanute on the Danish throne, he did not find much difficulty in bribing Olaf's people to join him. Ormund, King of Sweden, helped Olaf with troops, and in 1025 an alliance was concluded between them against Canute and preparations for war were made.

The year before this Olaf's son, Magnus, who succeeded him as King of Norway, was born. It is said he was not the son of Astrida, but an illegitimate child. His mother was a beautiful girl of royal birth named Alfhildis.

In 1027 he was repulsed by Canute, and being warned of the perfidy of some of his subjects he fled to Sweden and Russia, but returned to Norway in 1029. Then occurred an incident which shows how zealous he was for the Catholic religion. Nine hundred Norwegians offered to join him, but they were heathen, and he refused to enlist them as his soldiers unless they were baptized first. Four hundred consented and were baptized; the other five hundred refused and left. He is said to have had altogether 3,600 men, all of whom wore a white cross on their helmets, and their battle-cry was: "Forwards! Forwards! Christ's people, Cross people, King's men."

Four Icelandic scalds went among the troops, relating the incidents of the battle in verse. A fifth was absent on a pilgrimage, which afforded the other scalds opportunities of girding at him, which they never neglected.

The night before the battle of Stiklastad, in which he was slain, Olaf passed a long time in prayer and watching, and in the morning he called his army to go to confession and hear Mass, at which all communicated, after which, as the enemy had not appeared, Olaf fell asleep and had a dream, in which he thought he was standing on the top of a ladder, and just as he was about to enter heaven he was awakened by one of his generals with the news that the enemy was close upon them.

There was an eclipse of the sun that day, and from half-past two to three it was perfectly dark. Olaf was slain before then. He was wounded in three places, but he fought most bravely. His sword was blunted and would not cut, and after his second wound, dealt him by Thorer Hund, he threw away his sword and prayed to God to help him. Thorer wounded him a third time and he fell,

and all his followers were slain with him. Olaf was thirty-five at this time.

After the battle was over Thorer went to the body and straightened it and covered it with a cloak. When he washed the blood from the face it was as beautiful as when Olaf lived; the color in his cheeks was as bright as ever. Some of the blood fell on Thorer's fingers, where he had himself been wounded, and suddenly they were healed and needed no bandage, as Thorer himself declared openly as a proof of Olaf's sanctity, to which his enemies were the first to bear witness. In this battle Harold, his half-brother, Sigurd Porca's son, who was then only fifteen, was seriously wounded.

The Saga relates another miracle which was worked by Olaf immediately after his death. That same evening Thorgil Alma and his son Grim took the late King's body and carried it to some little distance from the town of Stiklastad and hid it in a small empty hut lest the enemy, and especially Thorer, should steal it. They washed it, wrapped it in a linen shroud and built up a heap of stones to conceal it, and then went back to the town to arrange for its burial. Presently a number of beggars who were following the army went round the town begging for food, and among them was a certain blind man led by a boy, who came to this hut, the entrance to which was so low that they could only enter by stooping. The blind man went in, stretching out his hands on all sides, searching for what he could find. Presently he felt something moist on the ground and accidentally touched his eyes with his hands. Then, saying no one could sleep in such a damp place, he went out and, to his amazement, saw his hands, and by degrees his sight came back entirely and he went to the town telling the people the damp from the hut had healed his eyes and restored his sight.

Thorgil and his son, hearing the report, guessed what had happened, and fearing Thorer, who they also knew was searching for the body, should find it, they took it away and hid it in a field. They then made a coffin and placed the corpse in it. Thorgil then bought a swift sailing vessel and taking seven or eight friends as a crew put the body on board and in the evening sailed for Nidarosa, which was about twelve miles distant.

On arriving at Nidarosa Thorgil sent to tell the Bishop, named Sigurd, that he had brought the late King's body from Stiklastad. Sigurd sent men to the ship to fetch it, and it was taken ashore, placed in an empty house and watched all night and buried before dawn, when Thorgil and his men returned to the ship and went back.

Olaf's body was afterwards moved to the Cathedral at Drontheim,

or Trondhem, which is still dedicated to him, though rebuilt in 1712. His cultus began immediately after his death. He was at once invoked and honored as a saint and is still regarded as the patron saint of Norway. He was admitted into the Roman Martyrology because he was killed in a war excited by his zeal in promoting the Catholic religion. He is honored on the day of his death, July 29. His fame spread to Germany as well as to Sweden and Denmark, where he is venerated, and in pre-Reformation days he was a very popular saint in England, where many churches, some still existing, were dedicated to him.[4]

In London four churches were dedicated to him—one in Old Jewry; one in Silver street, which was destroyed in the great fire of London; one in Southwark, and one to St. Olaf and St. Nicholas in Hart street. A modern church has been dedicated to him in Hanbury street, Mile End, and one at Stoke Newington. There is a St. Olave's in Chichester, one in Exeter, one at Marygate, York; one at Chester, one at Shipton-Oliffe, Gloucestershire; one at Fritwell, in Oxfordshire, and several near the coast; one in the Isle of Wight, at Gatcombe; one at Poryhill, Cornwall; one at Ruckland, Lincolnshire. The Church of Creeting, St. Olaf's, Suffolk, no longer exists. Herringfleet Priory, Norfolk, was dedicated to Our Lady and St. Olave, as the saint was more often called in this country.

Olaf was credited with working miracles in his lifetime as well as after his death, but the people were very superstitious and ignorant and ready to attribute anything they did not understand to a supernatural source. He was very generous to the Church and very charitable. He supported many widows and orphans, consoled the afflicted, advised and helped those in need. On the other hand, he was hard with his soldiers and punished thieves severely; but though he was very strict in avenging sins against God, he forgave all offenses against himself.

The story of the conversion of the people of Gudbrandsdate, which is told in most of the lives and legends of St. Olaf, throws a light on his character and shows the methods he had recourse to in dealing with idolaters. These people worshiped a great image of Thor, and Gudbrand, the chief man of the valley, at a meeting between him and Olaf said that if Olaf's God would make the next day fine he and his followers would meet the King and his men and bring their image with them and discuss the question which was the true God.

The next morning Olaf went to Mass, and the day being fine

[4] "Studies in Church Dedications," by Miss Arnold Forster, and Ecton's "Thesaurus."

afterwards to the council with Gudbrand, who then agreed if the next day were also fine he would either accept Christianity or fight. Olaf told his men to bore holes in the night in Gudbrand's ships, and to let loose all his horses, so that he and his followers could not escape by land or water. He then ordered a man named Kolbein to stand behind him with a battle-axe and to do exactly as he told him when the council took place. Presently Gudbrand and his men arrived, and bringing into a field the huge idol, which was decorated with jewels and precious stones, bowed down before it. Then he and his people congregated together on one side of the image, and King Olaf and his men on the other side of it. Olaf then told Kolbein when the idolaters were looking the other way to strike the image with all his might with his axe.

As the sun rose Olaf called out to Gudbrand: "Look to the east. Behold our God," and when the Gudbranders turned to look at the rising sun Kolbein struck the idol, and battering it open, out ran a quantity of rats, mice and other vermin; whereupon Gudbrand's people, who were mostly farmers, fled, but as their ships were scuttled and their horses lost they could not escape. Olaf then gave them their choice of fighting or of accepting Christianity. They sulkily submitted and were baptized, and the King told them to pick up the jewels with which they had decorated the idol and give them to their wives and daughters.

Another story of Olaf and Thor is told by Carlyle in his "Lectures on Heroes." Olaf was sailing from place to place along the Norwegian coast when one day a stranger, tall and robust, with a red beard and grave aspect, stepped on board, and after a while is brought by the courtiers to the King. The conversation appears to have turned on the beauty of the scenery, when the stranger made the following remarkable speech: "Yes, King Olaf, it is all beautiful, with the sun shining on it; green, fruitful, a fair home for you, and many a sore time had Thor, and many a wild fight with the Jotuns before he could make it so. And now you seem minded to do away with Thor; but have a care, King Olaf." And, frowning, the stranger, who was no less than the mighty Thor himself, disappeared and was never seen again in this world; which, we take it, is a highly picturesque way of describing Olaf's extermination of paganism. Perhaps we cannot do better than close this sketch of the great Norwegian saint's career with this dramatic exit of Thor, the pagan god, whom Olaf dethroned and whose cultus he abolished.

DARLEY DALE.

Gloucestershire, England.

CZAR NICHOLAS I. AND THE HOLY SEE (1825-1855).

THE evil policy of Catharine II., temporarily or partially arrested in the reigns of the Emperors Paul and Alexander, was consolidated and rounded out by her grandson, Nicholas. In the annals of modern persecution he holds a unique and ominous place. During most of his reign circumstances made him the dominant factor in continental politics, and he used this prestige to perfect certain traditional purposes of the Muscovite state, prominent among which was the thorough crushing of all Western influence and spirit, preparatory to the assertion of Holy Russia as the heir of Byzantine autocracy, the regenerator of Christendom and the mistress of the Orient.

"His dream," says an accurate historian of Russian Catholicism, "was that of all despots who are conscious of their power and accept unhesitatingly their allotted role, however fatal its ending. The realization of a triple unity, religious, political and national, throughout an immense empire that contained every variety of worship, government and climate; the establishment by every and any means of an unnatural unity similar to that which the Russian uniform stamps upon an army made up from twenty races and peoples; the straining in that sense of all the forces of an ultra-centralization that recoiled before no degree of violence or cunning, no succession of failures or defeats—such was the supreme aim of Nicholas I. during the thirty years that Providence tolerated in his hands the iron sceptre that he seemed to have received from Peter the Great himself. His chief obstacle was the Catholic Church, the only power that has at all times and everywhere bid defiance to every despot, however called, and which alone has the certainty of outliving them. Nicholas was to learn this in due time; meanwhile he set about the absolute ruin of the faith of Rome. He would enslave it by cunning regulations, seduce it by deceitful promises, or overwhelm it by the violence of open persecution.[1]

The bureaucratic character of the new empire, as established by Peter the Great, permits and assures the permanency and regular operation of any policy once inaugurated in the Russian state. If we consider the undeveloped condition of the Russian commonwealth and the many human sympathies that feed its hopeless corruption; if we add its territorial vastness, the vague terror of a secret and sudden sanction of every absolute command, the universal ignorance and degradation of the popular mind, the skilful intermingling of racial hate, political dreams and religious fanaticism, we shall grasp in a general way the ease and the confidence with which a born autocrat like Nicholas took up the policy of his wicked grandmother and pushed it unhesitatingly to that degree of success which the God of Nations occasionally tolerates for the sublime purposes that are later made known to His children.

We have seen how the unspeakable treason of Siestrencewicz laid low all the ready and natural opposition of the Russian Cath-

[1] Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernment Russe," Paris, 1903, p. 55.

olic Uniats and kept open all the roads that led to the usual centres of popular resistance to spiritual oppression. For the greater humiliation of Russian Catholicism and of the Holy See, the aged Archbishop of Mohilew disappeared from the scene (1825), only to make way for an even viler character—Joseph Siemaszko. For fifty years Siestrencewicz had drawn from the Russian treasury an annual salary of fifty thousand dollars, together with other perquisites, for which Judas-price he had sold the corner-stone of Catholicism in Russia—its unity with the See of Peter. But Siemaszko was destined to a more wretched fate, that of a public apostasy, entailing the loss of the Ruthenian Catholic hierarchy, such as it then was, and of several millions of Ruthenian Uniats. In the person of Siemaszko was finally consummated one chapter of the patient and crafty policy of Old Muscovy inaugurated on the downfall of Constantinople (1453) and further clarified and consolidated during the reign of Iwan III. (d. 1505).[2] It was just four hundred years (1439-1839) from the Council of Florence to the supreme treason of Siemaszko, from the creation of ecclesiastical unity by Cardinal Isidore, the metropolitan of Kiew, and his nine suffragans of Little Russia and White Russia, to the lamentable overthrow of the same by the most traitorous of the many traitorous agents of Russian imperial bureaucracy.

Ecclesiastical treason is particularly odious. It is committed on helpless multitudes who have passed away before it dawns upon the world that an irreparable wrong has been committed. For obvious reasons the agent of it is usually immune from personal punishment; such a traitor is a father who betrays his children, a tutor who abandons his wards, an administrator who squanders an estate. Cowardice, selfishness and malice dominate in such a guilty heart, and the sweep of the ruin they involve is commensurate with the dignity and responsibility of the offender.

Joseph Siemaszko was born in the department of Kiew and was ordained a priest in the Catholic Seminary of Wilna. In 1812 he was called to St. Petersburg as assessor in the Catholic College of

[2] The strongest element of Russian empire is the principle of unity impressed upon it by Iwan III. He created the unity of administration by centering in his own person all sovereign rights; political unity by suppressing the political existence of several provinces and free cities whose distinct forms of government assured a certain degree of independence; religious unity by detaching the Church of Russia from any foreign influence or supremacy and subordinating it to his own will. This triple unity, to which time has added military centralization, fills with its spirit the entire Russian state, and forestalls at every turn the development of any power or influence calculated to weaken it. It is this fundamental Russian unity, the work of Iwan III., that has been for four centuries the source of all Russian governmental action.—Pitzipios, L'Eglise Orientale Rome, II.—III., p. 67.

the Russian Uniats. The advent of Nicholas opened a way to the ambition of the young Siemaszko. In 1827 he laid before the new Czar a plan for the abolition of the Units or Ruthenians. Nothing could have been more welcome; it took up the secret suggestions made by Siestrencewicz in 1806, and was itself surrounded with deep secrecy until the accomplishment of its nefarious aims.[3]

He began by recalling the express intention of Catharine II. to extirpate the Russian Uniats in the conquered provinces. But after her death the local authorities relaxed their vigilance, and even looked with favor on the Uniat clergy. An ukase of 1800 treats the Uniats as Roman Catholics, and places them under the direction of the Catholic College at St. Petersburg, than which nothing could have been more disastrous, especially as in 1798 their dioceses had been reëstablished in Lithuania,[4] since which date no more Uniat parishes returned to the State Church.

What are the causes of this reaction among the Uniats? Siemaszko answers that it is partly owing to the influence of the proprietors of the soil—they are mostly converts to the Latin rite, while their dependent serfs continue in the ancestral Greek rite. The Uniat clergy sympathize with their benefactors, the Latin landlords. Moreover, the dispossessed Greek Uniat priests continue to enjoy in their parishes the protection of the Polish proprietor; Greek Uniat priests attend in Latin chapels and churches and even act as curates in the Latin parishes. *Even orthodox Russian parishes quit the State Church occasionally and join the Uniat body.*[5] As many as forty-four had thus gone over in the department of Minsk.

Entire parishes of the Greek Uniats had gone over to the Latin rite in White Russia and in Lithuania; similarly numerous families and individuals. He did not add that this was done in the hope of preserving their faith and escaping a formal apostasy to the State Church. Siemaszko goes on to insist on the simultaneous education of the youth of both rites in the same seminaries. At the same time the wealth and the social position of the Latin clergy

---

[3] The details of this plan were later made known by the Russian priest Marochkine. Cf. Fr. Martinoff, S. J., "Le plan d'abolition de l'eglise grecque unie," in *Etudes Religieuses*, Paris, 1873.

[4] By the Bull "Maximis undique pressi," dated from the Chartreuse of Florence, Pius VI., in accord with Paul I., had reëstablished three Uniat dioceses—Luck, Kamieniec and Minsk.

[5] Count Tolstoi is convicted of mendacity by this secret admission of Siemaszko, which he must certainly have read before he wrote ("Le Catholicisme Romain en Russie," Paris, 1864) that the Uniat (Ruthenian) Church had been created by violence, and was sustained by artifice and intrigue. Similarly a formal lie of Catharine II. to Pius VI. (November 4, 1782) is exposed by Père Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

react strongly upon the Greek Uniat clergy. Had time been granted to the Empress Catharine, she would have completely abolished the independence of the Ruthenians.[6]

When Catharine tardily nominated an Archbishop (Litowski) of White Russia he was urged, adds Siemaszko, to obtain from Rome the restoration of the Ruthenian rite as it existed before the Council of Zamosc (1720), *i. e.*, the abolition of the commemoration of the Pope at the Mass and of the Filioque in the creed. What would be her attitude, he argued, now, when the clergy of White Russia and Little Russia no longer conceals its preference for Latinism?[7]

In order to check the growth of Catholicism among the Russian Uniats Siemaszko proposed to the Czar the following measures: First, the creation of a special ecclesiastical tribunal for the Uniats, with the view of checking any additions to their rite and of compelling the exact observance of its ancient elements. This was aimed at the feasts and devotions with which the Ruthenian worship had been enriched since the sixteenth century, through contact with Catholicism. Second, the diminution in number and the territorial extension of the Uniat dioceses, and the nomination to these few vast sees of Bishops thoroughly cognizant of the imperial purpose and willing to execute it, *i. e.*, of traitors to Catholicism. Third, the creation of special schools and seminaries for the Uniats, from which all Latin students and influences should be carefully excluded. Fourth, the diminution of the Basilian convents, and their subjection to the diocesan authorities. As the latter were now to be traitorous agents of Catholicism, this was a double blow at Ruthenian monasticism, hitherto a very strong bulwark of the faith amid the disorder and ruin of the last fifty years. It was this subtle re-casting of the discipline, education and administration of the Ruthenian communities that, as we shall see, finally brought about the almost total extinction of Catholicism among the Uniats. These measures aimed at a gradual but sure segregation of the latter from all spiritual contact with their Latin brethren, at the suppression of all protest on the part of their shepherds, at the official distortion of the theology and history of Catholicism, at the extirpation of all lively piety and ecclesiastical independence

[6] In spite of her treaties and her protestations of humanity and tolerance, she did abolish in 1795 all the Ruthenian sees with the exception of Polotsk, and established in their place four Russian eparchies or dioceses. We have seen that in 1798 Paul I. restored three of the Ruthenian sees—Polotzk, Lusk and Brzesk—and in 1809 the diocese of Chelm.

[7] Russian writers usually speak of Catholicism as Latinism; national pride and suspicion are thereby made auxiliaries of systematic distortion and mendacity in matters of religion.

among the clergy, and at the extinction of all ancient habits and customs that could in any way remind the Uniat peasantry of the centre and head of Catholicism.[8]

Had Thomas Cromwell and his descendant, Oliver Cromwell, been gifted with the perspicacity of this priest of "Holy Kiew," what a wreck they might have made of Irish Catholicism! These few large and simple measures, stubbornly carried out in the spirit of the curial advisers of Catharine—Calvinists, Jansenists, Voltairians, Gallicans, Febronians—compassed the spiritual ruin of several millions of innocent Russian peasants, inaugurated a persecution of unexampled tenacity and ferocity, and blasted indefinitely the hopes of ecclesiastical unity that Rome had so long and so tenderly nourished in Lithuania and the Ukraine.

One more useful suggestion was made by Siemaszko—the purchase of consciences at the price of money and honors. Increases of salary, new and special insignia and frequent subventions to the minor clergy are proposed as arguments of an irresistible kind.[9]

II.

By an ukase of April 22, 1828, Nicholas I. called into existence the Greek Uniat College at St. Petersburg, soon to be a mere tool of the Holy Synod for the thorough Russification of the Uniat Catholics. It was a state bureau operating under the name of the now tratorous hierarchy of the Ruthenians, and destined to accomplish in one short decade the plan of Catharine II. In that time it excluded the Ruthenian clergy, secular and regular, from all control of ecclesiastical education, installed lay agents and Protestants in control of ecclesiastical affairs, imposed its arbitrary decisions on the monastic houses in matters of internal government and discipline, kept vacant with set purpose episcopal sees or filled them with aged, weak or morally unfit appointees, confiscated repeatedly the wealth of the monastic houses and suppressed a multitude of them. After the Polish insurrection of 1830 many thousands of Polish children were deported to Russia, all com-

[8] The Russian liturgy often recognizes the primacy of the Apostolic See, cf. Tondini, "La primauté de St. Pierre prouvée par les tîtres que lui donne l'eglise russe dans sa liturgie," Paris, 1867, and Dom Guépin, "Saint Josaphat Kuncewitch, archévêque de Polock, martyr de l'unité catholique et l'eglise grecque Unie en Pologne," Paris, 1874, *e. g.* I., 172.

[9] Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, p. 62. On the extensive clerical espionage of Russia, cf. the *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, passim; Döllinger, "Kirche und Kirchen" (1861): "The most insignificant priest in Albania, Corfu, Zante, Cephalonia, receives a small subvention from the ecclesiastical treasury of Nischnei-Novgorod." Similarly, he adds, the Slavs of Austria, the Wallachians of Hungary and Transylvania are subject to Russian influence.

munication with Rome was strictly forbidden, the most severe penalties inflicted on any one who converted a Russian subject to Catholicism, Russian legislation on mixed marriages extended to Poland, with the obligation of bringing up in schism all children of such marriages. At the same time no Catholic priest could legally perform such mixed marriages. Many Catholic parishes were suppressed by the renewal of an old law of Catharine to the effect that no parish should consist of less than a hundred families. Catholic priests of Latin rite were strictly forbidden to administer the sacraments to Greek Uniats, and no community of worship was henceforth tolerated between the two rites. Schismatic Russian sees were established in the old Ruthenian (suppressed) sees, many churches taken from the Catholics even in Warsaw, and a total uniformity of rite established (1834) between Greek Uniats and the State Church. In all these measures and many others Siemaszko was the right-hand and willing tool of Nicholas. He had been made Bishop of the Lithuanian Uniats in 1830 by the Czar, and accepted by Gregory XVI., who was, of course, unaware that for three years he had been maturing the evil plan which he was to pursue, step by step, until his death in 1868, and for whose final completion he was to leave behind him others of the same breed.

Thus, in 1831, become president of the Greek Uniat College or bureau, he ordered the withdrawal of the usual missals, rituals and breviaries of the Uniat clergy and replaced them by similar works printed at Moscow by the Holy Synod, but of course without commemoration of the Pope in the Mass or the recitation of the Filioque in the Creed. Any recalcitrant priest was punished by interment in some prison-convent of Russia or even by exile to Siberia, while his wife and children were taken from him and inscribed on the registers of the State Church. The ancient Catholic cathedrals of the Uniats were transformed externally and internally into Russian churches. The nomination of its pastors was taken from the Uniat Church and confided to the provincial governors, who placed in these offices vicious and corrupt men and removed every worthy and independent shepherd. A wretched subterfuge of Catharine was refurbished in order to withdraw many churches from the Uniats—if it appeared from the parish register that the church had been founded by Russian Greeks or had at any time belonged to them, the church was adjudged to the "dominant religion." Similarly a handful of malicious or disgruntled parishioners could hand over their church to the state-bishop and fix the stigma of legal apostasy on the faithful majority. Conversions to the State Church were paid for at a ruble per head. Schroeder, the Protestant governor of Witepsk, received from

Nicholas thirty-three thousand rubles for as many Uniat souls converted to the Emperor's religion. Ukase upon ukase, treason upon treason, violence and hypocrisy in quick succeeding acts, mark this decade of sorrow and humiliation. Byzantinism and Slavophilism had so worked upon the soul of the Czar that he came to be as it were eaten by a subtle and fierce mysticism of proselytism unequaled in the history of mankind.[10]

Bulhak, the aged metropolitan of the Uniats, refused to associate himself with these measures, and heroically bore the reproaches and menaces of the government which awaited impatiently the close of a life that yet withheld the consummation of the Ruthenian apostasy. His funeral, at least, was conducted according to the schismatic rite, and he was laid away among the Russian metropolitans in the cemetery of St. Alexander Newski.

Thereupon took place the formal renunciation of Ruthenian allegiance to the Holy See and the incorporation with the Russian Church of the Uniats of Lithuania and the Ukraine. The Official Gazette of St. Petersburg published in February 12 (24), 1839, the decree of a synod held by Siemaszko, with his creatures, the Bishop of Brezck and the Bishop of White Russia, in which three Judases proclaimed null and void the union of 1595, and requested the Czar to permit their return and that of their flocks to "the Church of their fathers." This momentous step was followed quickly by a series of imperial decrees and corresponding acts of Siemaszko and his fellow-traitors that consummated the quasi-total abolition of Roman unity in Russia. The event was celebrated with public rejoicing, the Russian press proclaimed the extinction of a "barbarous superstition" and protested beforehand against the judgment of history. It insisted on the peaceful nature of a triumph of persuasion and the overflowing joy of all the new converts at their restoration to the Church of their origin, their native tongue and their former faith. A medal was struck with the devise: "Separated through hatred in 1595; reunited through love in 1839." It was in vain that Gregory XVI. protested in an allocution of November 22—the Czar no longer feared or needed him. In the Pope's unhappy letter to the Polish Bishops in 1832, on the morrow of the insurrection, the Russian autocracy had secured from Rome all that then seemed desirable and had seemingly exhausted the

[10] Pere Lescoeur says (*op. cit.*, p. 74) that Nicholas surpassed even Catharine, and interpreted her decrees in a more odious sense than she intended. Every Uniat priest had to choose between the State religion, imprisonment, the galleys or the mines. It was a mercy when only their families were ruined; Siemaszko's own father refused to apostatize, and reproached his son for his criminal deeds. He owed it only to his advanced age that he was not deported to Siberia.

latter's power of retaliation. Secure against revolution at home, foremost in war and diplomacy abroad, striding with rapidity on the roads of India and Constantinople, the new Byzantium seemed really on the point of presenting to the astonished eyes of the Western "barbarians" another Justinian who should scourge their lawlessness, abate their pretentions, and recast human society on the lines laid down by the Holy Synod, or rather by the dark and cruel spirits who work through that horrid puppet.

III.

The sufferings of the Uniat clergy and people in the former Russian provinces of the kingdom of Poland since the advent of Nicholas I. have been so often told, and by such authoritative and eloquent pens, that a fresh recital of them seems unnecessary.[11] Suffice it to say that no form of persecution was spared them during his fateful reign. Long and cruel and wantonly distant imprisonment of courageous village priests and Basilian monks who refused to read the new liturgical books, quasi-enslavement under immoral and apostate brethren, confiscation of their small properties, scattering of their families and incorporation of their children with far-away schismatic families, exile to Siberia, frequent scourgings and servile work of specially humiliating character, arbitrary deportation from province to province, enforced ignorance of all outside sympathy, contemptuous betrayal of every appeal to the heart of the "Little Father" of all Russians—what measure of oppression was left untried by the bureaucrats of St. Petersburg and the fanatics of Moscow in the seemingly interminable reign of Nicholas? The cruelties practised on the Ruthenian clergy were repeated with unspeakable severity against the numerous parishes that resisted manfully and openly the power of the Northern Colossus. Several authentic "acts" of these common martyrdoms are extant and cause the pages of Eusebius of Cæsarea and Cyprian of Carthage to

[11] The official history, with its (90) "pieces justificatives," is told in the Allocution of Gregory XVI., dated July 22, 1842; cf. "Esposizione documentata sulle costanti cure del Sommo Pontefice Pio IX. a riparo de'mali che soffre la Chiesa Catholica nei dominii di Russia e Polonia," Rome, 1866, pp. 55, with one hundred official documents. Cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1867, vol. IX.-X. (sixth series). The facts of Siemaszko's treason and the imperial hypocrisy and violence were revealed to Europe by Theiner in a celebrated (German) work, translated into French under the title of "Vicissitudes de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie," 2 vols., Paris, 1843. Cf. (Horrer) "Persecutions et Souffrances de l'Eglise Catholique en Russie," Paris, 1842. The details of the execution of Siemaszko's plan of 1827-29 may be seen in the work of Dom Bérengier, "Les Martyrs Uniats en Pologne," Paris, 1868; cf. Pelesz, "Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom," 1880; Ed. Litowski, "Geschichte des allgemeinen Verfalls der unierten ruthenischen Kirche im 18 und 19 Jahrhundert," Posen, 1885-1887.

pale before these unadorned tales of Russian malice. It may be that a clement and lax execution of rigorous legislation is characteristic of Russian power; if so, the Ruthenians are a certain exception, and their attachment to Rome *the* unpardonable crime of a Russian subject. Who would not be moved to tears by the story of the dragoonings in the villages of Pryzbrodzie (1841), Dudakowitzé (1841-1854), Porozow (1834-1872, Dzirnotwizé (1858)? All resemble one another in their simple and monotonous brutality of injustice. Protestant governors and Russian "popes" enter the Uniat hamlet, seize the church and the notables, burn the villagers' huts, inflict on venerable men and delicate women the cruel torture of the knout, collect and deport the children and depart with threats of a new visitation. At Dudakowitzé the Uniats refused for eleven years to appear in the Russian church or accept the Russian "pope." They baptized their own children and were married by their aged men, a wretched tolerance being exercised by the "pope" for such money as they could put together. Finally, in 1854, on the eve of the Crimean War, all the brave confessors of the village were exiled en masse to Siberia. These inhuman measures were repeated in many parishes—the reader may peruse with pity the pages in which Père Lescoeur (op. cit., pp. 88-91) describes the treatment of the Uniats of Porozoff and Walkowysk from 1834 to 1862.

The interrogatory of the twelve-year-old swineherd, Stephen Suchonink, is characteristic of the temper and the principles both of the persecution and the persecuted. It deserves, as do many other pages of this history, to be written on plates of gold. The cause of Catholic unity can never perish while it can inspire such accents of devotion on the lips of babes and sucklings. Moreover, there can be no truth in the charges of ancient wrongs done by the Latin clergy to the ancestors of these Uniats, so long as it can be shown that in the Uniat villages of 1839 there existed not only no resentful memory of this alleged violence, but on the contrary a great respect and love for Catholic unity, visible in the headship of the Bishop of Rome. It is to the accident of her evasion that we owe the knowledge of the sufferings of Irena Macrina Miecyzlawska, Abbess of Minsk, and her companions. These pages, typical of a thousand similar wrongs, stirred the heart of Catholic Europe and revealed abundantly the depths of violence and mendacity that existed in the official heart of Russia, but for any softening of the same they might as well have been cast on the winds that sweep the endless steppes of Muscovy.[12]

[12] Martyre de Soeur Irène-Makryna Mieczyslawska et de ses compagnons en Pologne," Paris, 1846; cf. Szadowski, "Macrina Mieczyslawska, Aebtissin von Minsk," Freiburg, 1864.

Of such a nature was the storm that tore away from Catholic unity, at one fell gust, some two million Ruthenians[13] and cleared Russian soil of nearly every vestige of Roman influence and authority in matters of religion.

In the seventeenth century Rome could contemplate eight millions of Ruthenian Uniats living in peace and harmony in Little Russia and White Russia, commingling with their Latin brethren of Lithuania and the Ukraine, but retaining their ancient liturgical rites, language and customs, their married clergy and their national and racial habits. It was a noble hope, owing to the efforts of Eugene IV. at the Council of Florence, to the prayers and labors and trials of holy souls in the sixteenth century, to the religious zeal of the Kings of Poland and the tireless devotion of several religious orders, notably the Jesuits. It did seem as if a wedge had been entered in the hopeless mass of apathy and quasi-death that stood for the religious life of Russia, as if the Greek schism might be practically closed could these Catholic Ruthenians continue to increase and eventually draw over the huge bulk of their own race. Divine Providence ordered it otherwise, and even tolerated one more fierce outbreak of imperial hypocrisy and mendacity and of domestic treason in high ecclesiastical office.

After 1839 there remained, not in ancient Russian territory, but in the kingdom of Poland, one Ruthenian see, that of Chelm and Beltz, in the department of Lublin. By decrees of July 14 (26), 1864, and June 18 (30), 1866, Alexander II. confirmed its existence with certain rights and privileges of the Ruthenians of Poland. But this was only in expectation of the proper traitor or rather series of traitors. In 1871 Marcell Popiel, Archbishop of the Cathedral of Chelm, became administrator of the diocese, having first pledged himself in favor of the extermination of this last remnant of the Ruthenian Uniats. The Diocese of Chelm was united by him, May 11, 1875, with the schismatic archbishopric of Warsaw. Popiel was made Bishop of Lublin with residence in Chelm. All the faithful Ruthenians of Poland were pursued anew, in the same spirit and with the same means as of old—the usual place of exile was the province of Orenburg or that of Cherson. The knout of the executioner and the sabre of the Cossack, together with odious comedies of popular submission, soon Russianized the See of Chelm. Its three hundred Ruthenian parishes and 250,000 Uniat souls were inscribed on the registers of the imperial church,

[13] Marion, "Histoire de l'Eglise" (Paris, 1905), III., 733. According to official (unreliable) date, there were yet in Russia 87,994 Uniats in 1889. Among them 10,737 were living in marriages not recognized by the government, and 29,239 were yet unbaptized.—*Century Magazine*, July, 1905, p. 460.

and the last official trace of the union of 1595 was wiped out. Schismatically inclined Galician priests of the Ruthenian rite had come over from Austrian Poland to aid this evil work, moved by hatred of Polish influence, by Russian gold and by an insane Slavophilism that the Russian Government carefully nourished in the sense of its own pretensions.[14] It may be added that while Russia was engaged in this infamous business she was preparing to wage war against Turkey (1877) in favor of the Christians of the East, far less cruelly oppressed than her own Ruthenian subjects in Poland and Lithuania.[15]

IV.

All the ecclesiastical traitors of the Ruthenians, high and low, put forth as a principal excuse and justification of their conduct the supreme duty of preserving the original purity of the Greek rite as practised in Little Russia and White Russia from time immemorial. They asserted that for the last two centuries great violence had been used by Polish nobles and Latin religious orders to compel the abandonment of their rite by multitudes of Ruthenians, even whole villages and territories. The Latin Catholics were also accused of continually corrupting the Ruthenian forms of worship by the introduction of new ceremonies, feasts and religious customs, and of encouraging the personal transition of Ruthenians from Greek to the Latin rite. Similar accusations are accumulated in Count Tolstoi's "History of Roman Catholicism in Russia" (Paris, 1864), but when asked for the proofs of his charges they were not forthcoming. It is true, says Père Lescoeur (*op. cit.*, p. 19), that the Polish aristocracy did not always govern wisely in the broad lands it had conquered from Russia in the Dnieper Valley during the sixteenth century; that the Ruthenian nobles had almost entirely passed over to the Latin rite before the end of the eighteenth

[14] All the unfortunate priests of Galicia, voluntary or involuntary exiles, are attracted to the Diocese of Chelm, where, like Popiel, they become canons, parish priests or even Bishops, replacing the faithful shepherds, who are driven out or sent to Siberia. Their condition in life is quite wretched. Being married and fathers of families, they appreciate highly the subventions from Holy Russia. They are also very numerous, and through them the 2,300,000 Ruthenians of Galicia and the 800,000 of Hungary and Transsylvania are exposed to the political intrigues of Russia, whose pretentions to Galicia are based not only on the Russian origin of nearly one-half Galicia, but also on the identity of rite with that of the Ruthenians of Poland."—Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, 438.

[15] Cardinal Hergenroether, "Kirchengeschichte," III., 897; cf. *Civiltà Cattolica*, 1875, v. 632 (series ix.), and *Etudes Religieuses* (1874), 25, 548; (1875) 943. The details of the suppression of Chelm and Beltz are given by Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 418-471.

century, and thereby lowered the status of the Greek rite, which was henceforth the rite of the serfs and the poor. It is also true that, in spite of the Papal provisions, the Greek rite of the Ruthenians suffered some corruption of Latin usages. Nevertheless, there are extant no historical proofs of genuine Polish or Latin oppression of the Ruthenians as such. The admirable "Life of St. Josaphat Kuncewitch," by Dom Guépin (Paris, 1874), gives ample evidence of the fact that, unwisely enough, both Polish nobles and clergy were rather prone to discourage the Union of 1595 and to encourage the schismatic efforts of their Russian neighbors and rivals. The Polish Kings of the seventeenth century were, as a rule, tolerant and favorable, in a measure unknown to contemporary European rulers, to whom the peace of Augsburg and the Treaty of Westphalia had left a free hand in the religious affairs of their States. Not only did the elected Kings of Poland tolerate a Græco-Russian hierarchy in the ancient territory of Kiew, but they confirmed and endowed the local university, established by the schismatic patriarch and learned enemy of Rome, Peter Mogilas; they tolerated closer relations between the schismatic patriarchs of Kiew and Moscow, nor had they any reason to regret this attitude, since it resulted in the return to Catholic unity of the Sees of Leopol, Przemysl and Smolensk. In spite of the increasing power and prestige of Russia during the seventeenth century, and the corresponding decline of Polish fortune and constitutional wisdom, the last traces of the Russian schism were steadily tending to disappear throughout Lithuania and the Ukraine. As a matter of fact the sacred Catholic work of the Union of Brzesk in 1595, the outcome at once of religious and political causes, was consecrated by the glorious martyrdom of the Archbishop of Polozck, Josaphat Kuncewitch (November 12, 1623),[16] and the Jesuit Bobola (May 16, 1655). Joseph Velamin Rutzki, Uniat Archbishop of Kiew (1613-1635) escaped with difficulty from the savage hatred of the Russian party, and merited to be called by Urban VIII. "the Athanasius of Russia."

Far from tolerating or conniving at the destruction or corruption of the Ruthenian rite, discipline and customs, the Popes of Rome have never ceased to insist on their maintenance and integrity. What guarantee could be more formal or explicit than the action of St. Pius V. in 1568, when he declared, apropos of the new missal and breviary corrected by the desire of the Council of Trent, that they were not obligatory on any church that was in possession of

[16] Cf. the Life of St. Josaphat by Dom Guépin. It contains accounts of other cruel sufferings inflicted on the Uniats by the schismatics. It is also valuable for its historical account of the relations of Poland with the Græco-Russian Church, the Union of Brzesk and the vicissitudes of the Ruthenian rite and people.

its own rite or liturgy for two hundred years? Clement VIII. accepted the Union of Brzesk in 1595 with the precise condition of maintaining the rite, customs and ceremonies of the Ruthenians such as they had been in the days of their ancient and original union with Rome.[17] Since then there has been no change of attitude on the part of the Holy See, and each succeeding Pontiff has renewed the provisions of his predecessors that aimed at a proper respect for the ancient Greek rite of the people of Russian origin in the once vast ecclesiastical territory of Holy Kiew, the cradle, be it remembered, of Russian Christianity.[18] The famous Council of Zamosc in 1720 regulated still further the relations between the Latin Poles and the Ruthenian Uniats. Its decrees were carefully considered

[17] Cf. Baron d'Avril, "Les Eglises autonomes et autocéphales" (451—1885), Paris, 1895, pp. 37-45, gives the petition of the Ruthenian Bishop of Brzesk and the Roman formula or confession of faith in an interesting contemporary French translation by Marc Lescarbot, Parisian lawyer and first historian of Nova Scotia, "un précieux et même touchant document de la langue religieuse de la France à la fin du XVI. siècle," ed. by Prince Galitzin, Paris, 1856. Many official documents of the Holy See, that alone manifest the spirit and intentions of Catholicism in this matter, are indicated by Cardinal Hergenroether, "Kirchengeschichte," III., 328-329, 559. The extensive Bullarium of Benedict XIV. contains many very important documents, and it is to be remembered that his legislation is yet valid and authoritative. The efforts of Pius IX. and Leo XIII. to maintain the purity of Oriental rites and to reassure the Christian races and peoples of the Orient are so numerous that a large volume would scarcely describe them with accuracy. Cf. d'Avril, "Documents relatifs aux Eglises de l'Orient et à leurs rapports avec Rome," Paris, 3d ed., 1885; Nilles, "Kalendarium Manuale utriusque ecclesiae," I., Innsbruck, 1896; "Symbolae ad illustrandam historian ecclesiae orientalis in terris coronae S. Stephani," 2 v.; Silbernagl, "Verfassung und gegenwaertiger Bestand Sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients," 2d ed. (1904), 325-385; Michel, "La Question religieuse en Orient et l'Union des Eglises," Paris, 1893, pp. 87-93. Cf. also passim "Acta Pii IX." and "Acta Leonis XIII.," Rome, 1846-1903, annual official publications of public Papal documents. The reader may also consult with profit Theiner, "Vetera Monumenta Poloniae et Lithuaniae," fol. Rome, 1864, and Fr. Pierling, S. J., "La Russie et le Saint Siège," Paris, 3 vols., 186, 1901; Beurlier, "Le Pape et les Eglises d'Orient," *Revue du Clergé Français*, December, 1894; P. Fournier, "La Constitution de Léon XIII. sur les Eglises Unies, Revue générale de droit international publie," Paris, January, 1895.

[18] Leger, "La Chronique de Nestor," Paris, 1890; cf. Pisani, "A Travers l'Orient," Paris, 1897, pp. 117-118: "The Russians never took part in the doctrinal polemics nor in the political conflicts of the Byzantines. They were one element of the Oriental patriarchate, and as such shared its vicissitudes. Hence no precise date, no striking event can be pointed out as the origin of the separation of Russia from Rome. It took place implicity, gradually, without apparent motives, by reason of the Russian incorporation with the patriarchate of Constantinople. When the latter broke with Rome its obedient subjects everywhere were supposed to follow the example of the dominant see. On the other hand, the influence of the Greeks, who often held the dioceses of Russia, their violent theological quarrels with the Latins, and their perfidious insinuations sufficed to create an abyss whose depth only future ages should ascertain." Cf. Pitzipios, "L'Eglise Orientale," Rome, 1855.

at Rome in 1724 and positive instructions added that aimed at the strict observation of the traditional rite of the Uniats.[19] In this Council, as on other occasions, the Holy See was watchful lest the purity of Catholic faith should be affected by the close contact of the Ruthenians with their schismatic brethren of the Russian race. The commemoration of the Pope in the Mass and the recitation of the Filioque in the Creed were so intimately connected with the Catholic faith that there could be no reason for objecting to them. It was, in all probability, the retention of precisely these two items that quickened the opposition of the Holy Synod under Nicholas and called forth the imperial cruelties. On the other hand, the Latin Church had never ceased to develop a rich and attractive devotional life, while for many centuries the religious spirit, both before and after the loss of Constantinople, the Greeks had been sinking into somnolency and the repose of decay. In close contact with the devotional activity of the Polish communities, the Ruthenians could not but admire and imitate the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, frequent reception of the sacraments, the use of the rosary, the system of confraternities and the like. All this was a scandal in the eyes of the idle and corrupt Russian State clergy, also a menace to the supremacy of the autocratic régime in Russia. Its apathetic millions might one day awake to the promise of better things, cast off the carefully nurtured ignorance of Catholicism, and reconsider this relation with their Christian brethren of Western Europe. The Ruthenian Uniats were the open door for these splendid hopes; hence it must be closed with all due haste and thoroughness. The Catholic statesmen of Central and Western Europe paid little enough attention to the incredible expansion of Russia in the seventeenth century, and the pretentions of the Muscovite to the inheritance of the Palaeologi seemed of little account. In those days Poland was their "sick man." The eyes of European diplomacy seemed closed to the great political use the Romanoffs were making of the racial identity of the great centres of Moscow and Kiew. The former was growing yearly in stable and centralized power, in population and in political use dom. Iwan the Great and Iwan the Cruel had contributed their large share to the work of Russian consolidation, and a Peter the Great could at last look down on the chess-board of European politics from a vantage ground of security created for him in the long reigns of a few predecessors who had trampled under foot systematically the feudal pretentions of boyards and the religious consciousness of patriarchs, while they led the Christian peasantry

[19] Its decrees are found in the second volume of the "Collectio Conciliorum Lacensis."

of their limitless plains in successful combat against Mongol, Tartar and Turk. The autocratic soul of Czardom is no development of history, but rather the issue of many centuries of Russian "Sinnen and Trachten," as much a product of the monotonous "Black Earth" plains of the Volga and the Dnieper as their flowery vegetation or their melancholy atmosphere, a curious mosaic of history, race, climate and topography, such as perhaps will never again be shown to mankind.

V.

The Polish insurrection of 1830-1831 was a very ill-starred undertaking. Russia had indeed done more than enough to rouse the high-spirited Poles to action. Religious oppression, the kindling of race hatred, the constant violation of the Constitution that Alexander I. had forced on the kingdom in 1815, the unpopularity of Grand Duke Constantine, the exclusion of the Polish army from the war against the Turks (1829) and other grievances, more or less urgent and capital, stirred the heart of Poland. It was yet a State in some real sense. An army of 60,000 men, in good condition, kept up the hope of the nation and the military training of a warlike race. The Warsaw outbreak of November, 1830, took on the character of a national uprising. The news of the July days in Paris and similar movements in Europe fed the passions of the oppressed people; brilliant skirmishes and some victories encouraged their leaders, but from the beginning the fate of the movement was sealed. Neither England nor France could lift a hand to help it, for an inimical and conniving Prussia stood guard for her northern co-parcener along the flaming border of Europe's "Dark and Bloody Land." By September, 1831, the Russian general could notify the Czar that Warsaw lay at his feet. "Order reigns in Warsaw!" was the proud laconic announcement of the Russian chancery to sympathetic but weak Europe of the thorough overthrow of the White Eagle. Discordant military counsels and radical dissension as to the main object and character of the uprising lamed all bravery and devotion. A Chlopiczki and a Czartoryski differed from Joachim Lelewel and his followers—the noble and the soldier from the academic thinker and the dreamer over the vanished glories of the Jagellons, so long the buffer of mediæval Europe and the hammer of Tartar and Turk. Nicholas refused to listen to any compromise during the conflict. This apostle of absolutism was determined to exhibit to Europe a clear diagnosis, *in corpore vili*, of the ailments that the revolution was everywhere nourishing. Execution, stern and implacable, walked the land.

Confiscation, imprisonment, Siberian exile, were the fate of all concerned and of many innocent victims of the uprising. There was no longer even a simulacrum of a Polish State. The kingdom disappeared, the Constitution of 1815 vanished, the army was incorporated with that of Russia. Taxation, governmental districts, judicial procedure, were all recast on Russian lines and the administration of Poland confided to a horde of needy and corrupt Russians, with the usual proportion of base and traitorous Poles. It was the Ireland of Oliver Cromwell and King William, with here and there a line of discrimination. In the former Russian provinces of Poland there had been sympathy for the insurgents on the part of their fellow-Catholics, the Ruthenians. Czartoryski's educational propaganda had made some headway, but Nicholas crushed remorselessly the tender plant. The University of Wilna was closed, the Polish tongue banished from the schools and the religious measures set on foot that in less than ten years consummated the scandalous apostasy of nearly the whole Ruthenian rite in Russian territory.

Now the Latin Catholics of Poland were made to feel the weight of autocratic anger. The convents were confiscated en masse; of three hundred there remained scarcely one-third. Vicious and complaisant ecclesiastics were raised to episcopal sees in order to execute the imperial will. Courageous Bishops and priests were exiled for their refusal to concur in the same. Bands of soldiers harassed the Polish land incessantly and expelled on all sides the monks and priests who yet sustained the spirit of the Poles, and bade them never despair of their religion or their fatherland. The official "Espozisione documentata" of Pius IX.[20] contains among other documents the detailed report of Mgr. Holowinski, Archbishop of Mohilew, and alone is sufficient to convict the Czar of mendacity, hypocrisy and utter disregard of all Christian principle in his dealings with his unhappy Roman Catholic subjects of Poland and their protector, the Holy See. Diminution of parishes enforced scarcity of seminary students, closing of Catholic churches, enforced transportation of thousands of refractory Poles to distant parts of Russia, building of schismatic churches, encouragement of bad and insurbordinate priests, cruel exile of the steadfast clergy, minute harassing of Catholic life in all its manifestations were the order of the day during all the reign of Nicholas, and while he was as constantly assuring the Holy See that his imperial word was the guarantee of accurate execution of the reasonable wishes of the Holy Father.[21]

[20] Rome, "Segreteria di Stato," 1866, translated into French, Paris, 1868.

[21] On December 17, 1845, shortly after his famous visit to Gregory XVI.

Although the soul of Nicholas harbored so many traits of a peculiarly vicious and immoral nature in a ruler of men, and although he was nearly all his reign, as it were, "on the knees of the gods," he still desired to appear before civilized Europe as a man of honor, a model of righteousness and correct deportment in all things. Otherwise the sanctity of Russia would be affected, and the spirit of the revolution rejoice to point out iniquity crowned and regnant, the lie seated on the prone corpse of truth, sheer force holding by the throat the refined figure of civilization. Hence he is concerned to throw a cloak of reasonableness and equity over all his acts. He appeals, as did his grandmother Catharine, to the current prejudices and sentiments; thus shall his name be sung in the academies of learned men who live on the imperial bounty and in the venal press that alone he tolerates in his Russia. His measures against the Catholic convents[22] are all taken in their interest and in the interest of the Roman Church and according to its spirit and even its laws! He confiscates their property, but to found charitable institutions and schools (!), or even "to free the clergy from cares that are incompatible with their estate." So shall the Paris mob be flattered when St. Petersburg repeats thus patly its lesson. The organic statute of February 14, 1832, is granted to Poland (on the morrow of the insurrection) in the name of liberty of conscience, to be executed as we have seen. He promises the defeated Poles at least provincial assemblies in place of their suppressed Parliament; he never convoked these assemblies, and the Poles were too weak to compel him to keep his word. Knowing the principles, convictions and personal character of Gregory XVI., he entertains him with assurances of the imperial resolution to uphold ancient order and impose silence and restraint on the revolution. Knowing also the Papal sense of duty and the earnest representations of authorized counsellors, he hastens to protest, in autograph letters and by his envoys, that he is resolved to protect his Catholic subjects, respect their convictions and assure them a peaceful condition of life. He granted certain amnesties to the Polish insurgents on paper, but as to their execution let the

---

Czar Nicholas wrote to the Pope as follows: "The Emperor begs the Sovereign Pontiff to believe with all certainty that no one desires more than His Majesty the maintenance of the Roman Church in Russia and in Poland on a footing at once dignified and respectable. The prayers that the Emperor offers up to heaven embrace with equal solicitude, and without distinction of rite, the spiritual interests of all the peoples confided to his care by Divine Providence. Whatever can be done to realize the intentions of the Holy Father without conflicting with the organic laws of the Empire or violating the rights and canons of the dominant Church will be done. *The imperial word guarantees this to His Holiness.*"—"Esponsizione documentata," II., 17. Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, 100-101.

[22] Rohrbacher, "Hist. de l'Eglise," XXVIII., 412.

foregoing persecution of the Polish Catholics reply, also such facts as the following: In September, 1831, he ordered five thousand Polish nobles to be transported from Podolia to the borders of the Caucasus; they were to be selected among those who took part in the late insurrection and returned within the appointed time to make known their repentance.[23]

VI.

The decade of general ecclesiastical history from 1830 to 1840 will always attract the attention of students as one in which came fast to their ending certain lines and currents of European affairs set in motion on the morrow of the Battle of Waterloo. The famous alliance of the three imperial powers, both formal and moral, seemed awhile to check the flow of revolutionary ideas and success. The Congress of Vienna (1815) decreed, in eternal oblivion of the revolution, the restoration of the temporal power of the Holy See, and within the sphere of their influence the three world powers proceeded to restore and consolidate anew an autocracy that for several reasons was more odious than any of the forms of civil absolutism let loose by Martin Luther. On the other hand, secret political societies multiplied on the continent and through Russia and Poland, and nourished among the poor and lowly, *i. e.*, among the European multitudes, feelings of discontent and anger that were destined to find vent in various ways and in several quarters. False or hopeless ideals of civil welfare were held up by the Paris clubs and their imitators and by the miscellaneous Jacobins of every ilk and nation. The St. Simonians of France and the Carbonari of Italy, however different their aims, sympathized in their denunciation of all obstacles, *i. e.*, the existing forms of government. Civil society everywhere felt the ground weak and uncertain. It was a period of reaction, therefore, in its own way violent and extreme and particularly odious to a multitude of the youthful and middle-aged who had been nurtured on the hopes and promises of 1789. To them this period seemed like the threshold of a political hell.

Vestibulum ante ipsum primisque in faucibus Orci.

The Papacy was but slowly recovering from the unspeakable humiliation of the preceding fifty years. Traditions of administration, habitual sources of information, continuity of policy, assured contact with the dominant factors of civil life, had all been swept away or so modified as to make it a new world in which the See of Peter was not yet quite sure of its political assiette. The French Revolution had executed all the menaces and velleities of Jansenists,

[23] The Minister of Finance to the Governor of Podolia, September 9 (21), 1831.

Gallicans and Protestants—the future was dark and uncertain. The power and prestige of Russia were very much in evidence throughout Europe and were borne to the clouds by all manner of social and political serfs of the Czardom. The time was propitious for Nicholas to impress on Gregory XVI. the wisdom of coming to an understanding with him. The Polish insurrection was represented by the imperial agents as an outcome of Parisian revolutionary agitation, and the Polish clergy falsely made to appear as the foremost leaders in secret intrigue and open conflict. The Pope was urged to call this refractory clergy to repentance. At the same time he was assured that the repression of the insurrection had been a benefit to Catholicism. It was insinuated that the sanguinary movement was only the opening scene of a vast European rebellion against established order. As a matter of fact, the States of the Church were even then the scene of revolutionary agitation and uprisings. The agents of Prussia and Austria confirmed the desires of the Czar. Gregory XVI. accepted this statement of facts and wrote, June 9, 1832, to the Polish clergy an encyclical letter, in which he treated of the eternal maxims of the Church concerning submission to the temporal power, and asserted that the frightful calamities of the insurrection were owing solely to the cunning and mendacious manœuvres of those who "under pretext of religion lift up their heads in our unhappy age against the legitimate power of princes." He went on to speak of the abuse of the credulity of the simple people by perverse men and insisted at length on the divine origin and character of civil obedience. Much of what he said was applicable at all times and in every land. The following phrase could concern only Poland:

> Your very powerful emperor will always exhibit toward you great mildness, and will always receive with good-will our intercession in your favor; also all requests that you will make for the welfare of the Catholic religion, that the kingdom professes, and to *which he has promised me that he will never refuse his protection.*

In its doctrine the Papal document was inoffensive and correct, but the circumstances made it especially painful and odious in the eyes of the Poles and their sympathizers. Coming on the heels of an inglorious defeat and while the machinery of vengeance was yet active and urgent, it seemed like a denial of all right of rebellion against intolerable wrong and like a cruel abandonment to the victor of the faithful sons of Poland.[24]

They were condemned on the representations of their powerful

[24] On the right of rebellion against the civil authority in given cases and situations, see Balmes, "Protestantism and Catholicity Compared," cc. 54-56; also P. Ventura, "Essai sur le pouvoir public," p. 295, and J. Torres Asensio, "Le droit des Catholiques de se défendre," Paris, 1874 (cc., VII.-VIII.), and Crétineau-Joly, "L'Eglise Romaine devant la Révolution," II., p. 241.

enemy and by that power for whose sake principally they had risen in a revolt that was imprudent enough, but was none the less heroic and objectively justified. Usually all Roman documents were strictly excluded from the empire, but this one was given the widest circulation. It was pointed out to all Poles that the Holy Father made no distinction between the Catholic faithful who had revolted and the irreligious revolutionaries. They were even led to believe that the Holy Father had excommunicated them. A cry of grief went up from a multitude of Catholic hearts. Some of them, like Montalembert, scarcely recovered from the condemnation of Lamennais, bled very deeply on this occasion.[25] Others, like Lacordaire in his "Lettres sur le Saint Siège," penetrated to the core of the situation and found relief in comparing the Papal action with that of Priam kissing the hand of Achilles while he beseeches the slayer of his son for the poor gift of his dead body. In the second edition of his work on the condition of Catholicism in Russia Père Lescoeur communicates a touching interview of the Polish nobleman and general, Count Zamoyski, with Gregory XVI.[26] In the course of this meeting the Polish patriot gave expression to the sentiments of sorrow and dejection which yet filled the hearts of his poor beaten compatriots who had imagined that they were defending the holiest of causes, and yet had incurred the Papal disapprobation. Thereupon the Holy Father seized him earnestly by the shoulders and with a look of reproach exclaimed with vehemence:

"Indeed, I never disapproved you. I did not understand you in the beginning, I admit, but in turn did you take sufficient pains to enlighten me in the course of your conflict? Yes, I have been deceived in your case; my own servants, to whom I am bound to give my confidence, allowed themselves to be deceived, and then led me into error. I deplored your misfortunes; but after all you had succumbed, all seemed finished, it remained to save religion from the wrath of an irritated victor. His menaces moved me profoundly; I trembled at the persecution that seemed ready to rage against you and to surpass all that had yet taken place. *I yielded to a downright challenge: it was stated to me that, to begin with, all the Bishops of Poland would be exiled to Siberia if I did not send them an order to submit.* I asked myself what would become of your unhappy nation, deprived of its shepherds and already so far removed from me that for a long time my voice has failed to reach you. I thought in conscience that in the presence of such dangers I could and ought to consent to address some words of resignation to your Bishops and recall to them what the apostles imposed upon all Christians, something also that the Church has invariably observed, viz., that obedience to the powers that be is a Christian duty, one of conscience and not of fear. I did not fail to add that in no case was it permitted such a power to insist on the commission of acts contrary to the laws of God or the Church. . . . What more was necessary to reassure your consciences? When my letter reached you, were not the rights of the Church and religion already sufficiently trampled on? I might perhaps complain that you forgot to keep me sufficiently informed. Perhaps, too, I might reproach you with not reading attentively enough my letter, with not perceiving in the very delay of the same the constraint that had been put upon me."

[25] Lecanuet, "Vie de Montalembert" (Paris, 1903), I., pp. 311, 354.

[26] Lescoeur, "L'Eglise Catholique et le Gouvernement Russe" (Paris, 1903), second ed., pp. 110-113.

The Pope, moreover, authorized Count Zamoyski to make known this conversation, but with discretion, he added:[27]

"I had entered the Papal presence," says the Count, "with bitterness and with much prejudice against his person; I quitted it filled with gratitude and the deepest veneration."

In the latter part of 1832 the Pope repeatedly attempted to obtain some redress for the suffering Catholics. He desired, among other things, the presence of a Papal agent at St. Petersburg, but this measure of confidence and justice was never agreed to by the Czar. While the compulsory conversion of the Ruthenians went bravely on, the cruelties practised on Catholic Poland increased. Only evasive or impudent answers were vouchsafed the letters of the Pope, and he could soon convince himself that the Czar had overreached him, played upon his well-known detestation of revolutionary principles and taken advantage of his monastic simplicity and inexperience of the world. What Nicholas had extorted from him was not a weapon against the revolution, but one against Catholicism itself. The Russian Government continued to affect a total ignorance of all the facts quoted by the Pope in his correspondence—oppression of the clergy, confiscation of the convent properties, deportation of thousands of Polish children to schismatic territories. When the Pope invoked the treaty of 1773, that guaranteed the liberty of the Catholic religion, the Emperor replied that since the insurrection Poland had only such rights as he cared to allow! Thus the Czar is *post Deum terrenus Deus*, and keeps locked up *in scrinio pectoris sui* all laws, human, ecclesiastical and divine! This answer was returned in 1833, after the close of the insurrection; moreover, after the publication of the organic statute of 1832, which the Pope had urged as a valid charter of religious liberty that even a Czar could not repudiate. "Be silent," said Repnine in the Diet of 1767, when the Polish deputies demanded the religious rights formally granted by Catharine. "Be silent; it belongs to me alone to know the true meaning of my sovereign's declarations."[28]

---

[27] General Zamoyski's account of his interview with Gregory XVI. is strikingly confirmed by the mute but eloquent fact that this encyclical to the Polish Bishops is not to be found in the Bullarium of Pope Gregory. . . . By this suppression of the document its nullity was publicly avowed. It had been obtained by threats and trickery, and by a false statement of facts which had entirely disfigured in the Pontifical mind the true character of the Polish insurrection.—Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-114.

[28] This quiet nullification by the local authorities of even the miserable privileges of a persecuted race and religion is one of the most odious forms of Russian oppression. The offender is seldom or never punished; he knows too well that he is, above all, an agent of extermination. That the system has not changed may be seen from the following fact: "Appeal to the law and you invite the revenge of a horde of officials, who rarely lose an opportunity of showing their contempt for the laws. A business man

The corruption of diplomacy could go no farther unless, perhaps, we recall the cruel cynicism with which the Czar denied that he had ever given the famous order of April 10, 1832, for the deportation to Minsk of all the children in the Kingdom of Poland between six and seventeen, with the eventual purpose of sending them to the distant and inhospitable "military colonies" of the frontier. Several years afterwards, in 1834 and 1838, the children of Polish nobles were still sold in their native villages at thirty dollars a head.[29] No wonder that a Polish mother cast herself upon the body of her exiled child and plunged a poinard into his heart rather than see him stripped at one blow of mother, religion and fatherland! The Russian agents at Rome continued to implore the Pope not to listen to any reports of religious affairs in Poland, save such as reached him through the hands of the Czar's accredited representatives. But the anti-Catholic matrimonial legislation of 1836, the cruel treatment and forced resignation of the brave Bishop of Podlachia, Marcellus Gutkowski, the ineffable dishonor of the Ruthenian apostasy, the prohibition in 1840 to use any longer the term "Greek Uniat"—these unjust and oppressive acts that cover the decade from 1832 to 1842 moved at last a long-suffering Pope to the magnificent allocution of July 22, 1842, in which he made known to the Catholic world his constant and numerous but useless efforts for the welfare of Catholicism in Poland, and rose above himself by the touching narrative of his deception by the Czar, whereby he had given cause to the faithful of Poland to believe that the Holy See had abandoned them to their enemy.

VII.

But if Pope Gregory could be deceived, he could not be restrained from making a public confession of the facts in the case. When patience had ceased to be a virtue and the opinion of his own entourage had become noticeably adverse, he broke a long silence and delivered before the assembled Cardinals the famous allocution we have just referred to. Despite all contrary accusations, he had never been wanting in zeal and resolution to improve the condition of Polish Catholicism. He declared that he had been circumvented by its enemies, after their habitual fraudulent manner. He

about a month ago went to a certain provincial governor and made a protest against some flagrant abuse of authority. The great man airily waved aside his expostulations. 'But the law?' began the visitor. The governor took a thick book from his table and held it so that the title could not escape being seen—it was the Russian Code—and then put it upon his chair and sat upon it."—*Century Magazine*, July, 1905, p. 457.

[29] Lescoeur, p. 118, Ukase of April 13, 1838.

had long borne the accusations of negligence, complicity and even cowardice, and had come to know that not a few looked on him as a stumbling block and a stone of scandal. He would now, however, relate in their true order and meaning all the phases of the negotiations with Czar Nicholas since the beginning of his pontificate. Then followed an outline of the events in question and a collection of (90) "pièces justificatives" or authoritative documents. The Pope had stooped to conquer. All Europe applauded this brave act of self-denial and Christian humility. Public opinion, enlightened passed to the side of the Papacy and the oppressed. A weak and aged man had stood forth before the world as a champion of truth and affixed the indelible stigma of mendacity upon the forehead of the world's proudest and most powerful monarch. It seemed for a moment as if Innocent III. or Gregory IX. had stepped upon the scene. While the Papal exposé of facts did not greatly relieve the sufferings of the Catholics of Poland, it simplified the political situation by the removal of all equivocal sentiment as to the attitude of the Papacy. It also restored to the latter its liberty of action and arrested a growing discontent among very faithful children of the Roman Church.

Three years later (1845) Czar Nicholas came to Rome. His meeting with Gregory XVI. was an historic one, although no reliable account of their mutual discourse has ever been made known. In his "Recollections of the Last Four Popes" Cardinal Wiseman has left us a graphic account of the imperial visit to the Vatican that has often been quoted, but can never lose a certain racy vigor of expression and a noble breadth and accuracy of historic view:

> The most painful of his conflicts, however, was one face to face with the greatest of Europe's sovereigns, a man accustomed to command without contradiction and to be surrounded by complete submission. He did not imagine that there was a human being who would presume to read him a lesson, or still less to administer him a rebuke. It may be proper to premise that the present Emperor of Russia, while Czarewich, visited Rome and was received with the utmost respect by all ranks and with extreme kindness by the Pope. The young prince expressed himself highly gratified by his reception, and I was told by those to whom he had declared it that he had procured a portrait of Gregory, which he said he should always keep as that of a friend deeply venerated and esteemed. Further, in 1842 the Emperor, his father, had sent very splendid presents to the Pope—a vase of malachite, now in the Vatican library, and a large supply of the same precious material for the Basilica of St. Paul. Still he had not ceased to deal harshly, not to say cruelly, with his Catholic subjects, especially the Poles. They were driven into the Greek communion by putting it out of their power to follow their own worship; they were deprived of their own Bishops and priests, and even persecuted by more violent inflictions and personal sufferings. On this subject the Holy See had both publicly and privately complained, but no redress and but little, if any, alleviation had been obtained. At length, in December, 1845, the Emperor Nicholas I. came himself to Rome. It was observed, both in Italy and, I believe, in England, how minute and unrelaxed were the precautions taken to secure him against any danger of conspiracy; how his apartment, bed, food, bodyguard were arranged with a watchful eye to the prevention of any surprise from hidden enemies. Be this as it may, nothing amiss befell him, unless it was his momentous interview with the head of that Church which he had mercilessly persecuted, with him whose rival he considered

himself as real autocratic head of a large proportion of what he called the "Orthodox Church" and as recognized protector of its entire communion. It was arranged that the Emperor should be attended by M. de Bouteneff, his Minister at Rome, and that the Pope should have a Cardinal at his side. He selected, as has been said, the English Cardinal Acton. This was not a usual provision for a royal visit, but gave it rather the air of a conference; and so in truth it was. The Pope felt he had a solemn and trying duty to perform. Could he allow the persecutor of his flock to approach him and depart without a word of expostulation and even of reproof? Could he receive him with a bland smile and insincere accolade; speak to him of the unmeaning topics of the hour, or of the cold politics of the world? Impossible! It would have been at variance not with personal disposition, but with the spiritual character which he held of father of the faithful, defender of the weak, shepherd of the ravened flock, protector of the persecuted, representative of fearless, uncompromising, martyred Pontiffs, vicar of Him who feared no stalking any more than prowling wolf. It would have been to his conscience a gnawing and undying reproach if he had lost the opportunity of saying face to face what he had written and spoken of one absent, or if he had not employed his privilege as a sovereign to second his mission as a Pontiff. He would have confirmed by his cowardice or his forbearance, though it might have been called courtly refinement or gentleness of character, all the self-confidence and fearlessness of a fanatical persecutor, placed above all but some great moral control.

The Popes no longer stood, as in the thirteenth century, at the head of an united Christendom, the mouthpiece of the moral sense and the intimate convictions of all the peoples of Europe. Schism, heresy, apostasy, revolution and indifference had swept away multitudes in every part of Europe from their once affectionate allegiance to the See of Peter. Gregory XVI. could now look forward to no other applause than that of his own conscience and of outraged justice. It was now the case of impersonal right clothed in the simple majesty of a feeble old priest withstanding with successful boldness the greatest of modern autocrats at the acme of his power and prestige.

Certainly, much hung in the balance of that Pontiff's deliberation how he should act. That meekest of men, Pius VII., had not neglected the opportunity of his captivity to enumerate with fervid gentleness to his powerful master the evils which the Church suffered at his hands. Gregory never undertook any grave work without much prayer, and one so momentous as this was not assuredly determined on except after long and earnest supplication. What were the Emperor's intentions, what his ideas, what his desires in coming to Rome, and having necessarily a personal meeting with the Pope, it is impossible to conjecture. Did he hope to overcome him by his splendid presence, truly majestic, soldier-like and imperial? Or to cajole and win him by soothing speeches and insincere promises? Or to gain the interpretative approval of silence and forbearance? One must conjecture in vain. Certain it is that he came, he saw and conquered not. It has been already mentioned that the subject and particulars of the conference were never revealed by its only witness in Rome. The Pope's own account was brief, simple and full of conscious power: "I said to him all that the Holy Ghost dictated to me."

And that he had not spoken vainly, with words that had beaten the air, but that their strokes had been well placed and driven home, there was evidence otherwise recorded. An English gentleman was in some part of the palace through which the imperial visitor passed as he returned from his interview, and described his altered appearance. He had entered with his usual firm and royal aspect, grand as it was from statue-like features, stately frame and martial bearing, free and at his ease, with gracious looks and condescending gestures of salutation. So he passed through the long suite of ante-rooms, the imperial eagle, glossy, fiery, "with plumes unruffled and with eye unquenched," in all the glory of pinions which no flight had ever wearied, with beak and talon which no prey had yet resisted. He came forth again with head uncovered and hair, if it can be said of man, disheveled, haggard and pale, looking as though in an hour he had passed

through the condensation of a protracted fever; taking long strides, with stooping shoulders, unobservant, unsaluting; he waited not for his carriage to come to the foot of the stairs, but rushed out into the outer court and hurried away from, apparently, the scene of a discomfiture. It was the eagle dragged from his eyrie among the clefts of the rocks, "from his nest among the stars," his feathers crumpled and his eye quelled by a power till then despised.

The reflections of the illustrious artist of this unique scene concerning the rôle of the Pope are doubtless just and to the point. His conviction that from that day dated a juster treatment of the Polish Catholics was not destined to be sustained by the quick succeeding facts of religious oppression in every odious form it can put on. The deadly Byzantinism of the imperial character was too original and intense, too steadily fed by its native springs to permit him ever to see in free Catholicism anything but a menace against the common welfare of the state as his ancestors had consolidated it and he had inherited it.

But let us be fully just. The interview did not excite rancorous or revengeful feelings. No doubt the Pontiff's words were in the spirit of those on the High Priest's breastplate—"doctrine and truth," sound in principle and true in fact. They convinced and persuaded. Facts, with their proofs, had no doubt been carefully prepared, and could not be gainsaid. The strong emotion which Gregory on other occasions easily betrayed could not have been restrained here. Often in prayer has every beholder seen the tears running down his glowing countenance; often those who have approached him with a tale of distress, or stood by when news of a crime has been communicated to him, have seen his features quiver and his eye dim with the double sorrow of the apostle, the tear of weakness with the weak, the scalding drop of indignation for sin. This sensibility cannot have been stemmed, even by the coldness of an interpreted discourse, but must have accompanied that flow of eloquent words to which, when earnest, Gregory gave utterance.

All this must have told effectually where there could be nothing to reply. Mistaken zeal, early prejudice and an extravagance of national feelings had no doubt influenced the conduct of the Czar towards his Catholic subjects against the better impulses of his own nature, which Russians always considered just, generous and even parental. No one had before possessed the opportunity or the courage to appeal to the inward tribunal of this better sense.

The Concordat, signed in 1848, between Russia and the Holy See was never executed with honesty and equity. Its surveillance in Poland was entrusted to its worst enemy, Skripitzine. As if that were not enough, the new Russian criminal code made penal, and therefore illusory, nearly every right granted by the Concordat. From the days of Pierre de la Vigne some lawyer has ever stood close to the ear of absolutism in nearly every great Christian crisis and pointed out, for a consideration, how religion might be manacled and enslaved in the name of right and justice. In his memorable report of Pius IX. Holowinski, the Catholic Archbishop of Mohilew, laid bare all the ways of oppression, violent and hypocritical, that were followed during the remainder of the reign of Nicholas.[30] The latter died in 1855, after a successful consolidation of his personal authority and an equally successful series of cam-

[30] Lescoeur, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

paigns against obsolete Persia and decrepit Turkey. He had extended the limits of the state, but had not deepened or ennobled the popular life. He created a venal and conscienceless press that in turn begot and justified the most insane forms of revolutionary propaganda. He was on all occasions the enemy of France and played a notable rôle in the upbuilding of modern Prussia and in the burning internal conflicts of Austria. He let loose and encouraged among his people a rabid Slavophilism, yet beneath its shadow he bound them with hopeless knots. He had no confidence in democracy that was to him as sin and hell. Yet he was bound to behold his empire insulted in the Crimean War by the two most democratic nations of Europe. He died in a kind of dumb impenitent despair February 19 (March 2), 1855, an unbending man of iron will, dogmatic confidence in himself and a firm persuasion that the proper destiny of mankind was an unquestioning obedience to the will of the successors of Michael Romanoff.

Thomas J. Shahan.

Washington, D. C.

A CATHOLIC COLLEGE IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

IT HAS often been remarked that history, though always repeating itself, is ever new. Not only are fresh documents daily brought to light, but the store of facts already known shapes itself differently, according to the standpoint from which it is viewed. In proportion as some special form of human activity is drawn attention to by the needs or the interests of the moment, it is given more prominence as a factor in the evolution of society. Hence the field of historical research is widened and the ever-fusing ore of history is recast into new moulds.

Thus, in the second half of the nineteenth century, the study of social questions originated a totally new conception of the Past, *i. e.*, from the point of view of political economy. A numerous school of historians have since made it their special object to inquire into the production and circulation of wealth at the various stages of social life. Thus also, *si parva licet componere magnis*, the keen interest in pedagogics roused of late by educational reforms has caused many to turn to the closer study of bygone theories. True it is that a theory as such "can claim but a secondary place in the logical structure of a science, yet no one can deny its primordial influence on the course of scientific research."[1] Hence we may say

[1] D. T. cf. "Revue des Questions Scientifiques," Vol. LV. (1904), p. 611.

that it is impossible perfectly to understand the working of our old Catholic colleges without going back to their origin and considering the circumstances in which they were founded and organized.

Beyond this, however, the history of Catholic education has a very useful lesson to teach:

Quien no sabe el passado
Ciego va en el presente.[2]

The present position of Catholic schools is unquestionably full of difficulties, but it is stimulating and encouraging to consider what it was some three hundred years ago, and what was then achieved by men of enterprising spirit and energy. At the end of the sixteenth century, public education being made impossible for Catholic youth in England, arrangements had to be made for its continuance on the continent. Thus an "outlaw race of schools and colleges, the seminaries beyond the seas," became part of that wonderful Foundation Movement, which at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century gave a new life to the Catholic Church in England and a new organism suited to these days of persecution.[3]

Prominent among these schools of the Catholic Renaissance was St. Omers College,[4] the ancestor of Stonyhurst. But, though its history in later periods of its existence has often been told in detail, there is no connected record of the making and first organization of the college; and yet this first "link" in its evolution requires closer consideration if the training at St. Omers is to be fully understood. It will therefore be the object of the present article to make known this early "constitutional history" chiefly from unpublished documents.

Our principal authority is the "Custom-Book" of the college, of which more will be said later on.[5] The information it gives us has been supplemented by some manuscripts in the possession of the Society of Jesus, which were kindly communicated to the present writer by Fr. Alfred Poncelet. They belong to the correspondence of the Fathers General with the German Assistency ("Germaniae

[2] Who does not know the Past, goes through the Present like a blind man.

[3] Cf. Fr. J. H. Pollen, S. J., "The Rise of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation." (*The Month*, 1897, II., pp. 581-600.)

[4] We prefer to use the old English spelling, "St. Omers," instead of the modern form, "St. Omer." Cf. Fr. Gerard, S. J., "Stonyhurst College," Belfast, 1894, p. 2. An interesting point of comparison is afforded by the description of college life at St. Alban's College, Valladolid, given by Bishop Yepez in 1599. (Cf. Dom Bede Camm, the Ven. John Roberts, O. S. B., or in the "Revue Bénédictine," Vol. XII. [1895], pp. 318 foll.)

[5] It will be referred to in this paper as C-B. I gladly take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to the Rev. D. A. Stracke, S. J., who found this MS. in the library of the Catholic University of Louvain and kindly brought it to my attention.

Epistolae ad Generalem"), and will here be referred to as "G. Ep.," with the number of the volume and page. Other materials have been drawn from the Brussels "Archives du Royaume." The most important among them is the "Responsio ad obiecta a Magistratu,"[6] a petition sent by Fr. Schondonck in 1609 to the Privy Council of the Low Countries. Besides setting forth the chief objections of the local authorities, it gives a fairly complete notion of the working of the seminary.

The sources of a study of this nature being mostly decrees and regulations, it might be objected that it can only claim to furnish a theoretical notion of the management of the school, and not to record its actual working, since laws are often less observed in proportion as they are laid down more frequently. Yet, though it may not commend itself to the so-called historian who only records well ascertained battles and treaties, a study such as this may be highly interesting to him who examines the making of educational schemes.

It draws besides an additional interest from the fact that many of the institutions and customs first established at that early period have weathered most critical crises and still survive at Stonyhurst College. Readers acquainted with the latter will easily notice the resemblance, which, for fear of tedious repetition, will not be pointed out in this article.[7]

In connection with the early organization of the college we shall insist somewhat on the treatment received by the Catholic exiles at the hands of the Spanish authorities in the Netherlands. The help given to the founders of St. Omers or the hindrances with which they had to count not only contributed to frame the particular character of the college, but are also an element in the broader and more important history of religious and political relations between England and the Continent. As is well known, during the protracted duel between the Protestant Queen of England and Philip II., the champion of Catholicism, it was the common policy of each sovereign to help his adversary's dissenting subjects both in their native land and in his own dominions. Hence, when difficulties arise on the part of local authorities, they are commonly overruled by higher decisions from Spain or from Brussels.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.[8]

When the school Fr. Robert Parsons had founded in 1582 at Eu,

[6] Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 31.

[7] For proof of this "continuity theory," cf. Fr. Gerard, *op. cit.*, Chap. II.

[8] Cf. Br. H. Foley, S. J., "Records of the English Province S. J.," Vol. VII., pp. 36 foll. Fr. J. Gerard, *op. cit.*, p. 1 foll. See below some details on the date of foundation.

in Normandy, was seriously threatened in its existence[9] negotiations were set on foot to start a new establishment at St. Omers.[10] About the end of 1592 Dr. Richard Barret, acting on Fr. Parsons' advice,[11] presented a petition to the Magistracy of the town asking leave for twelve or fifteen of the students of Eu to settle at St. Omers and attend lectures at the college of the Walloon Jesuits.

The request, to which was appended a letter of recommendation from Jean de Vernois, Bishop of St. Omers (18 September, 1592)[12] was immediately granted, and Fr. Flack delegated by Father Parsons, put up in a small house with seven students and Fr. Nicholas Smith, their "ghostly" father and "minister" of the house.[13] Before the end of the year the students numbered eighteen, and the little community moved into larger premises.[14] Yet they were still at a great distance from the house of the Walloon Jesuits, where classes had to be attended. In consequence, leave was obtained from the Magistracy in 1593 to acquire the Hôtel de Berghes, place de l'Etats, just opposite the college. So far nothing but favor had been shown by the town authorities to the English refugees. These good feelings were still encouraged by a letter written on July 30, 1593, by the Governor of the Low Countries, Count Mansfelt. In the name of his master, Philip II., he recommends to the Magistracy the newly-founded seminary and the fathers of the Society of Jesus.[15] But when, early in 1594, Fr. Flack petitioned to be allowed to acquire the Hôtel de Licques, an old mansion formerly belonging to the Countess de Roeulx de Vellamonte, he met with a refusal. It must be noticed, however, that the attitude of the Magistracy came from no hostile disposition, though they were to show themselves quarrelsome enough a few years later; at this time they objected only to a lordly residence becoming religious property,

[9] Fr. J. H. Pollen has clearly shown (*Stonyhurst Magazine*, Vol. 1 (1884), pp. 284 sq.) that the college continued at Eu till its removal to St. Omers.

[10] On the reasons which determined the choice of this town, see Br. H. Foley, *loc. cit.*, quoting Fr. H. More's "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," Vol. VI., p. 161.

[11] L'Abbé O. Bled, "Les Jésuites Anglais à St. Omer" ("Bulletin historique de la Société des antiquaires de la Morinie," Vol. VIII. [1890], p. 546). This assertion, which conflicts with Fr. H. More's statement (p. 162), may perhaps be explained by the great influence of Fr. Parsons on Dr. Barret, and by the fact that some of the students of Douay College (then at Rheims) had been sent to the seminary at Eu. (See J. Gillow, "Dict. of Engl. Cath.," s. v. Barret, Richard.)

[12] Cf. H. Piers, "Notice historique sur le collège Anglais de St. Omer" ("Archives . . . du Nord de la France," Vol. II. [1838], p. 5).

[13] Cf. Br. Foley, "Records," Vol. VII., pp. 38, 101, 261-2; Vol. VIII., p. 719.

[14] "l'Ancien hôtel du grand bâtard de Bourgoyne en la Tenne rue" (Abbé O. Bled, *op. cit.*, p. 547, from which the following details are drawn).

[15] Cf. J. J. E. Proost, "Les réfugiés Anglais . . . en Belgique" (*Messager des sciences historiques*, 1865, p. 300).

and advised the college authorities to look for a more modest building.

These difficulties were not to last long. Letters sent on March 4, 1594, by the King of Spain to the "Comte de Roeulx, grand Baylly et Governeur de St. Omer," and to Bishop du Vernois[16] helped to settle matters, and on October 24, 1594, leave was granted to the English seminary to purchase the Hôtel de Licques, on condition that it should not be exempted from the ordinary taxes levied on the other houses of the town.

This new site, where St. Omers College was to stand for nearly two centuries, offered the great advantage of being very near the Walloon house of the society. Nor was this settlement the only advantage the seminary derived from the favor of Philip II. To him also was due the endowment of the college, no small question in school organization. Already, in 1593, he had granted a pension of 10 scudi a month for every scholar, the town authorities being called upon to report on the number of boys actually present at the college.[17]

On May 16, 1594, he confirmed the pension of 2,000 pounds (scudi?) a year which he had granted, and gave leave to receive as many boys as could be supported without being a burden to the town.[18] No wonder, then, if the college should have kept a grateful remembrance of its founder. Thus we find in the Custom-book (p. 202) that every year on September 13, the anniversary of the King's death, all priests are directed to offer Mass for his soul, and a Solemn Requiem was to be celebrated. The college, being thus provided with the necessary means of existence, entered on its regular course.

We may now turn to the study of its internal life. To understand the management of St. Omers Seminary it is important to notice at the outset its strictly ecclesiastical character. "Whereas, the chief aim of the founders of this college has been religious piety, so the first care of the fathers who govern and serve this college has always been and still is to promote true virtue in the minds of

---

[16] Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 29. There also are to be found the deed of sale and the license of the magistracy, in which they expressly state that they submit to His Majesty's wishes.

[17] Abbé O. Bled, *op. cit.*, p. 549, "Consiliario Questori Generali financiarum Christophoro Godin numerum familiae quotannis scripto tradidimus" (Fr. Schondonck's "Responsio," quoted above, "2a. Obiectio, de Numero").

[18] H. Piers, *op. cit.*, p. 7. In a Latin petition to the King of Spain (second half of the seventeenth century) we find the following: "[Philippus II.] duas pensiones annuas eisdem seminario attribuit, unam 10,000 florenorum ex ipsa Hispania quotannis submittendam, alteram 6,200 florenorum a Financiis Regiis in Belgio annue solvendam" (Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 29).

the students and to imbue them with religious principles."[19] Indeed, St. Omers was chiefly intended by its founders to be an ecclesiastical school. Cardinal Allen initiated the foundation of seminaries, and thus prepared a new English clergy to take the place of that decimated by Elizabeth; but to Fr. Robert Parsons is due the credit of having completed this organization by commencing the college at Eu and later that of St. Omers. They were to be schools of secondary education destined to preserve Catholic boys from Protestant influences, but principally to prepare recruits for the greater seminaries of Douai, Rome and Spain.

In the minds of the founders the training received at St. Omers was designed both to pave the way for the higher studies and to inure the future priests from their boyhood to the duties of their high calling.[20] In fact, every year a certain number of St. Omers' students, having gone through their course at the college, either joined the Society of Jesus or set out for Rome or for Spain. As early as 1594 six of them, on their way southward with Fr. Baldwin, were carried off to England by pirates.[21] Three years later the rector, Fr. John Foucart, reports to the father general of the society that eight students were sent to the Spanish seminaries. After spending several months waiting for the winds at Calais or Dunkirk, they finally reached their destination.[22] The printed "Litterae Annuae S. J." (or yearly reports on the work of the society), speaking of the "Seminarium Anglicanum Audomarense," generally notice the number of students sent to Spain or to Rome, which varies between fifteen and twenty-two.[23] These "missiones" were such an ordinary feature of college life that the Custom-book prescribes (p. 200) the manner in which those who leave the college must be treated:

"They are to dine at the table of the fathers, and receive wine and double portions of everything. One of the fathers shall accom-

---

[19] Bruges "Archives de l'Etat," acquisitions, cahier 1, No. 10; beginning of a Latin prospectus of the college. See also "Records of the English Catholics," Vol. I., pp. 106, 107 and note; H. More, "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," p. 246.

[20] Canon A. Bellesheim, "W. Card. Allen und die englische seminäre auf dem Festlande," 1885, pp. 251-2. The "Constitutiones" drawn up in 1600 for the students are clearly intended for future priests. See also note 19.

[21] Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VIII., p. 1,147. Dom Bede Camm: "In the brave days of old;" also in the "Revue Bénédictine," Vol. XII. (1895), p. 318.

[22] "G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 319, letter of July 26, 1597. Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII., p. 30.

[23] Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 1147-1149. See *ibidem*, Vol. VIII., p. 521, a letter, dated August 17, 1610, from the rector of St. Omers recommending four "noble English youths," whom he sends to the English College, Rome, certifying "that, up to this time, they have studied Greek and Latin with remarkable proficiency." See also following note.

pany them the first night, sometimes also some of the students, if there is any special reason, as when a brother parts from his brother, all the students keep them company a short part of the way."

Yet, though St. Omers may be considered as an ecclesiastical seminary, it was one of a "mixed" character. Fr. Schondonck, in his "Responsio" of 1609, alluded to above, distinguishes among the boys two different categories, the alumni and the convictores. The former are admitted without fee. They live on the revenues of the college, and after a stay of four years are sent to the greater seminaries for their higher studies. Besides these, says Fr. Schondonck, at the request of His Majesty and of our Lord Gregory XIII. (sic) we have been obliged to take in boarders (convictores) also, with the result that the buildings, which had sufficed thus far for the alumni, could not accommodate the convictores.[24]

The reason for this new departure from the original idea of a seminary is obvious enough—the English Catholics had no proper schools, and the best way of giving young boys a Catholic education was to send them to the seminaries already established abroad.[25]

Thus it happened that St. Omers assumed a character similar to that of the present "petits séminaires" on the Continent, where the boys who prepare themselves for the higher clerical studies are brought up with those destined for other careers. It resembled also other early Jesuit schools, which were attended both by "scholastics" of the society and by laymen. Whatever may be thought of this system of semi-clerical education at the present day, no other workable scheme presented itself in Elizabethan times. The result of

---

[24] "Notandum alios in dicto seminario alumnos esse, alios convictores . . . In alumnis requiritur plerumque aetas annorum 14, ut deinde ubi in Seminario decimum octavum annum in studiis exegerint, destinentur ad collegium Romanum, Vallisoletum et Hispalense, quibus missionibus quotannis mittuntur a Seminario plures 20." . . . "Societas, cupiente Sa. Me. item Sanctissimo Duo Nro Gregorio XIII. (sic) suscepit curam huius Audomarensis Seminarii cum convictu eorum qui ex Anglia haereticorum educatione prudenter subtracti hic catholico ritu imbuerentur pietate, moribus, disciplinis." . . . "Cum constringat nos christiana necessitas," ut praeter alumnos admittantur quoque—convictores, opus habuit seminarium loco paulo laxiore Tametsi enim prior domus—ante sufficere visa sit alumnis, deerat tamen convictoribus locus" (Responsio," 2a. obiectio; 3a. obiectio). In 1549 the boys seem to have all been "alumni." On June 19 Fr. Holt, speaking of the Roman and Spanish seminaries, says: "Cum ut ad illa seminaria postea promoveantur ideo studiosi isti in hoc formentur et alentur" ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 317).

[25] H. More, "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," p. 162. Philip II.'s letter to the Bishop of St. Omers recommends to him "les enfants anglois eschappes de leur pays des mains des héréticques, qui s'efforcent les separer de leurs parents catholicques" (J. J. E. Proost, *op. cit.*, p. 300). "De quibus [pueris], ut catholicam fidem a teneris imbibant, et alios deinde eadem imbuant, parentes sunt valde solliciti, quod iam in Anglia sub omni lapide cubet (?) scorpius" (Fr. Schondonck's "Responsio," *loc. cit.*).

this naturally was that the boys were submitted to a rather strict discipline. Though receiving a training sufficiently complete to allow them to play their part in the world, yet they were constantly reminded of the high mission which in a near future their influential positions would call them upon to fulfil. "The end of the young men who are brought up in this community: . . . they have in view primarily the conversion of England, each according to his calling; for such is the reason why their friends sent them hither: first of all, that where the Catholic religion and honest living are so much shaken by Heretics, their own sons, on their return home, may stand boldly in their faith, and firm in their integrity of life; secondly, that amidst so many false teachings spread abroad in England, they may see for themselves and show to others where lies the right path; thus they mean to acquire both Piety and Learning."[26] What were the studies included in this latter part of the programme will be said in connection with the curriculum; suffice it to say for the present, that they corresponded to the course then called Humanities.

It has been told above how a few students from Eu settled at St. Omers in the autumn of 1592 in order to follow the lectures at the Belgian college. At a later period the English house became important enough not to depend any longer on its Walloon neighbor for the teaching of its inmates, and the connection was broken off. Thus two distinct periods are to be considered in the early history of St. Omers. It will be necessary to ascertain first of all *when* the strictly independent life of the famous college began.

Fr. H. More ("Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," p. 163) simply says: "Annis consequentibus, postquam domesticos intra parietes studiorum palaestra constituta est." . . . The exact date seems to be October 14, 1614.[27] This may be seen from two documents drawn

[26] From the Latin rules of the Sodality (C.-B., pp. 87, 88), partly quoted in Fr. More, "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," p. 427.

[27] Fr. Oliver Manare, on June 19, 1594, ordains that the boys of the seminary be not punished in class at the college, but sent home and punished by their own superiors ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 317). In the letter referred to in note 22 Fr. John Foucart reports (1597) that the English boys "in suis classibus fere primum locum obtinent." He asks not to be obliged to warn the Prefect of Studies of the college when he wishes to keep one of the boys at the seminary. The "Annuae Litterae S. J. anni 1598" (Lugduni, 1607), p. 239, speaking of the Walloon "Collegium Audomarense," also mention the English students as attending the lectures: "Florent in hac urbe tria Seminaria, quae scholas nostras vehementer nobilitant: . . . Tertium Anglicanum . . ." In 1600 the "Constitutiones" of the seminary recommend that the boys should go to and return from schools with the companions appointed, and not argue loudly on the way (C.-B., p. 5). Again, in the "Annuae Litterae" for 1600 (Dilingae s. a.), p. 228, we find about the "Collegium Audomarense:" Scholae nostrae "duobus florent praeclaris seminariis, altero . . . Anglorum altero; in illo

up in view of the Annual Letters of that year. The first, from the hand of Fr. Thomas Feck, after relating the manner in which the Passion play was acted in the college church, goes on to say: "It was happily brought to pass this year that we opened schools within the precincts of our own college. The school rooms are very suitable, though not yet perfect as far as decoration and accessories are concerned."[28] Another proof is an account signed "J. Wilsonus," *i. e.*, the Rev. John Wilson, a great benefactor of the college, in which is said that "on the 14th of October in the morning after Solemn Mass, the *new* schools were opened in this college."[29] If the reason be asked which determined the opening of the schools at that date, it might be suggested as a conjecture that the seminary precincts having been enlarged by the acquisition of a neighboring house,[30] there was room enough for an increase of the staff employed.

We have called the English establishment St. Omers *College*, but we are not prepared to discuss the real name which should be given to it before it constituted a wholly independent unit. According to the terminology used in the education system of the Society of Jesus, its technical name ought perhaps to be convictus, inasmuch as it was a boarding school,[31] or seminarium, like other establishments where boys were prepared for the priesthood. In fact, it was sometimes called college, more frequently seminarium. This is the name generally used by the "Litterae Annuae" and by the Jesuit superiors, for instance, Fr. Manare and Fr. Foucart.

The management of the seminary in the first period, when it constituted only a boarding school depending on the greater college, cannot be clearly determined. It was a time of groping and testing, during which no permanent academic organization was possible. The sources of information, moreover, though abundant enough as regards antiquarian details, throw but little light on the internal

alumni fere 40 degunt, in hoc 120; praest istis . . . , his praefecti sunt Patres Societatis." The "Responsio" of Fr. Schondonck, written in the same year, describes the whole house without mentioning school rooms.

[28] "Feliciter hoc anno effectum est, ut scholas aperiremus intra proprios Collegii nostri parietes, easque valde commodas, licet nomdum adsint ea quae ad ornamentum et complementum spectant . . . vi Novembris MDCXIIII., Thomas Fechus" (Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 29). About Fr. Feck, cf. Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII., pp. 247-8.

[29] "Die 14 Octobris mane post solemne sacrum aperiebantur in hoc collegio 'novae' scholae." The word "novae" is omitted in Foley's translation (*op. cit.*, Vol. V., p. 426) of the document, which is in the Brussels "Archives," ibidem.

[30] Abbé O. Bled, *op. cit.*, p. 552.

[31] Rev. T. Hughes, "Loyola," p. 100. "Societas admittit quoque curam Convictorum et tum vocantur illae societatis familiae 'Collegia cum Convictu'—Ita societas—suscepit curam huius Audomarensis 'Seminarii cum Convictu'" (see note 24).

working of the house. We shall thus mention here only what is special to the seminary in its earlier Auffassung, and leave for further treatment organizations which evolved themselves and survived in the full-grown college of later days.

The first difficulty which had to be met was one connected with the higher government of the house. By his letters of 1594 Philip II. richly endowed the seminary and overruled the objections of the Magistracy to the purchase of the new collegiate buildings. Yet to quiet their fears of danger on the part of a purely English community, he ordained by the same letters that the superior of the seminary should be one born in his own dominions, "un Recteur de la nation de mes pays de par de la."[32] Accordingly Fr. Flack resigned the superiorship and Fr. John Foucart, a Belgian, became rector or regent of the seminary. A natural consequence of this difference of nationality was that troubles cropped up not unlike those which disturbed other English seminaries, though of far minor consequence.

The new superior's views about education differed on some points from those of Fr. Flack and others, who feared that his more stringent discipline would deter parents from sending their children to the seminary. In his letters to superiors he urgently asks to be relieved fyrom his charge, adding humorously, after speaking of Fr. Flack: "For all that, there is one point on which we agree, which is that he thinks and wishes that the rector or regent of this seminary should be changed."[33] We shall see, when speaking of discipline, some of the solutions given to these domestic problems. Nor were they alone to be settled. The status of the house in its relation to the Walloon college also required to be legally determined. The college itself was governed by Jesuit Fathers belonging administratively to the Province of Lower Germany properly so-called, or Belgium.[34] Now, at the period we are

[32] See note 16. In a petition endorsed "Reasons why ye King of Spain and Infanta ordered an English Rector for the Seminary," we find the following: "No obstante las cartas que se escrivieron las 4 de Março 1594 al Governador, y al Obispo de S. Omer condescendiendo que el Rector fuesse natural dessos paezes." But the writer insists that no such stipulation appeared in the patent letters of foundation. "En la carta de la fondacion fecha en Bruselas à las 6 de Mayo 1594, no ay restriction ninguna, el Rey poniendo el Seminario en la superintendencia de la Compa. de Jesus puramente sin dezir otro" (Brussels "Archives du Royaume," Varia, S. J., carton 29).

[33] "In hoc tamen ego et ipse convenimus, quod indicet et velit mutari rectorem seu regentem Seminarii huius." ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 324, 6 December 1597.)

[34] The Province of Lower Germany, founded in 1556 by St. Ignatius, was divided, in September, 1564, by Fr. Laynez into two provinces: the Rhenish Province and that of Lower Germany proper or Belgium. On May 24, 1612, the latter was itself divided into "Provincia Flandro-Belgica" and "Pro-

speaking of the English members of the society were not yet constituted into a distinct province, but made up a "mission," governed by a prefect generally residing in Rome. Under him was a vice prefect living in England, with authority over the fathers employed in the island. Those still on the Continent, though governed by the local provincials in everything concerning domestic discipline, were subjected for the rest to the prefect in Rome, represented in Spain and Belgium by two local vice prefects.[35] A consequence of this rather complicated arrangement was that the rector of the seminary depended both on the prefect of the English mission and on the Belgian provincial. The latter, Father Oliver Manare, is the author of the first constitutional document we know about St. Omers Seminary.[36] It fixes thus the status of the superior in relation to the rector of the college: "It is just and in accordance with the common rule of the seminaries under our care, which are separated and distinct from the houses of the society, that their rector should be free in his administration and absolutely independent of the rector of our college. . . . But he shall be subject to the provincial and write to him as the rectors of the colleges do. He shall be bound to give him an account of discipline and of receipts and expenditures."[37] As regards studies, however, the English boys were to be entirely subject to the authority of the prefect of studies of the Belgian college. In a "memorial" of June 16, 1597, Fr. O. Manare, vice provincial, determined some rule to be observed in the matter. To the question: "Is it lawful for the rector of the seminary to allow the students to act a play without

vincia Gallo-Belgica," with which St. Omers Seminary was connected till 1619. (Cf. Fr. Carrez, S. J., "Atlas geographicus S. J.," pp. 5 foll.; completed from "Précis historiques," 1883, p. 420.)

[35] "Historiae S. J. Pars VI." (1616), J. Cordara (Romae s. a.), p. 199. See H. More, "Hist. Prov. Angl. S. J.," pp. 241-248; Foley, *op. cit.*, Vol. VII., pp. 60 foll., gives the list of the Prefects, Vice Prefects and Provincials; Fr. Morris, S. J., "Troubles of Our Catholic Forefathers," first series, pp. 200-201.

[36] It is a "Memorial" in the shape of a letter, dated June 19, 1594, addressed to the Fr. General ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 317), asking him to approve the answers lately given by the Provincial to questions about the management of the College. Fr. O. Manare is the author of several regulations for colleges S. J., *e. g.*, of those given to the "Collegium cum convictu" of Dilingen in 1582. See "Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica," Vol. II., pp. 263-264. See also Sommervogel, "Bibliothèque de la Cic de Jesus," Vol. II., col. 456-459.

[37] Justum est et cosentaneum usui communi Seminariorum, quorum curam gerimus, et quae separata et seiuncta sunt ab aedibus societatia, ut Rector eorum libere administret, neque dependeat ulla in he a Rectore Collegii nostri; conferret tamen ut in dubiis et incidentibus difficultatibus ipsum consulat, non externam aliquem, nisi eodem Rectore Collegii conscio. Dependeat autem a Praeposito Provinciali et ad ipsum scribat ut rectores collegiorum, eique visitanti teneatur reddere rationem disciplinae, ac dati atque accepti."

leave from the rector of the college?" he answered: "That must on no account be allowed to the superior, lest we might seem to put up altar against altar; for, although the jurisdiction does not depend on that of the rector, yet the direction of studies must be one and the same for all and for both communities."[38] Nor were private academic exhibitions to be given at the seminary without the agreement of the college authorities. "May orations, recitations and dialogues be held by our students at home privately or in the refectory?—Nor is that lawful; and experience teaches clearly that these exercises, both on account of their frequency and of the levity which they produce and foster in the students, are very harmful to their studies and literary training; therefore, that nothing be done in this line without leave of the prefect and even of the rector of the college, to whom we think fit that the regent of the seminary should defer in this matter. We do not forbid, however, that some short poem be composed to welcome and honour some grave men who may come to the college; but we think in the Lord that this also must seldom be done, and that this burdensome politeness must not be used for every nobleman."[39]

Another decision on the same subject may here be quoted as alluding to an interesting custom: "On the feast of Corpus Christi, when the procession passes by the seminary, or during the octave, is it not lawful for our boys to recite some poems in the form of dialogue, in honour of the Blessed Sacrament, without the consent either of the rector of the college or of the prefect of studies?—That must not be done either, for this pious homage has been suppressed in many other places on account of disorder, and it is not becoming that the people, following the Blessed Sacrament with great reverence, be distracted by these exhibitions. Another practice might be allowed, viz., that when the Blessed Eucharist draws near two English students, standing at some distance, should recite ten or twelve verses by way of welcome and greeting. These verses should be very suggestive and full of feeling, such as would move to tears and devotion; but they must also be first examined by the prefect of

[38] "Nullo facto id permittendum est regenti, ne videamur altare contia altare erigere: licet enim non dependeat ejus iurisdictio ex iurisdictione Rectoris, oeconomica tamen litteraria debet esse una et communis omnibus et utrique familiae" ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 318, 16 iunii 1597).

[39] Neque hoc licet, et experientia manifeste docet has exercitationes tum ob frequentiam, tum ob levitatem quam inde hauriunt et induunt studiosi, multum nocere ipsorum studiis ac profectui litterario; proinde nihil fiat horum nisi consentiente Praefecto et Rectore ipso Collegii, cui hac in re a Regente Seminarii deferendum ducimus. Non impedimus tamen quin possint brevi aliquo epigrammate excipi, et cohonestari viri aliqui graves, qui ad Collegium interdum aliunde veniunt; sed et istud rarum esse debere indicamus in Domino, neque quemvis nobilem cohonestandum hoc officio et onere" (*ibid*).

studies and the regent with his consultors; and when those of the college recite something, let nothing be heard from the seminary."[40]

The power of the prefect of studies extended even to minor details. Thus the rector of the seminary was bound to warn him whenever he decided for some good reason to keep one of the boys from going to schools.[41]

Apart from the question of studies the seminary constituted a complete unit. Its own spiritual life was from the first independent. In 1594 Fr. O. Manare, considering that "the house they inhabit is far from the college and has its own chapel,[42] in which ours celebrate," granted leave to administer the sacraments to all the inmates and to recite Vespers at home. Thus the students "will not be obliged to waste time and get disturbed by walking through the streets more often than is necessary." Catechism might also be taught at home.[43] We learn from Fr. Schondonck's "Responsio" that the English seminary had its own music masters, but the legislation on the matter does not seem to have been fixed till the era of independence.

Interior discipline required more immediate consideration. It was intrusted to three "prefects," each of them having under his special care one of the three large rooms into which the boys were distributed.[44] In the beginning the *lex caritatis* was the only safeguard of good behavior, but the necessity of corporal punishment soon suggested itself. The power of chastising the boys, which first belonged to the "minister" only, was later extended to the three prefects. This, however, was one of the points on which Fathers

[40] "Similiter in festo Corporis Xi., dum supplicatio per nos transit, vel infra octavam, nostris pueris non liceat foemata aliqua recitare per modum dialogi in laudem Venerabilis Sacramenti, nisi habito super hoc consensu vel P. Rectoris collegii vel Praefecti Studiorum. Neque hoc fiat, nam ob abusum hoc pietatis officium sublatum est multis aliis in locis, neque decet populum sequentem magna cum veneratione SS. Sacramentum, distrabi actionibus talibus. Secus esset si accedentem Sacratissimam Eucharistiam duo Angli eminus exciperent et consalutarent decem vel duodecim versibus tantum, valde emphaticis et affectuosis qui lacrymas excitent et devotionem; sed et hos versus prius examinet Praefectus studiorum et regens cum consultoribus suis; sed quo die Collegium aliquid recitat, omnino sileat Seminarium" (*ibid*).

[41] "Memorial" of Fr. Manare, quoted above; see also note 27.

[42] Fr. Manare ("Memorial" of 1597) had not allowed the seminary to open a public chapel, but only a private oratory, which was not to be "iuxta plateam, ne paulo post occasio quaeratur operiendae portae." Later, in 1606, the Provincial allowed them to open a chapel for the benefit of the English, very numerous in the town, especially since the peace of 1604. ("Litterae ammae S. J. anni 1606" (Moguntiate, 1618), p. 650; Abbé O. Bled, *op. cit.*, p. 550.) Of the boys' chapel, and the public church opened in 1610, more will be said in a future article, when speaking of the collegiate buildings.

[43] Letter of 1594, quoted above.

[44] Fr. Foucart's letter of July, 1597 ("G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 319).

Flack, Holt and Walpole could not agree with Fr. Foucart. Some time in 1597 three of the younger boys had plotted to go and beat another during the night. They were caught in the act and birched; whereupon the English fathers appealed to the vice provincial, but with no success, since the former decisions were maintained.[45] At the same time, it is worth noticing that the students of the seminary enjoyed a privilege in the matter, which was also shared by those of other seminaries under the care of the society: they were not to be punished in the schools like other boys for their shortcomings and faults unless the offense had been public and scandalous, as in the case of open rebellion. But, as a rule, they were to be sent home after the lecture to be chastised by their rector or prefect.[46] In spite of endeavors on the part of the prefect of studies and masters to bring them under the common rule, their charter of franchise, given in 1594 by Fr. Manare, was renewed in 1597.[47]

Such are the scanty details we have been able to collect on the first organization of St. Omers Seminary. We hope to speak at no distant date of the management of the college in its full development, when the rules and customs had been formulated and codified in the Custom-book by Fr. Giles Schondonck.

L. Willaert, S. J.

Louvain, Belgium.

[45] "Disciplina domestica in dies melior, ad quam servandam et stabiliendam conferet, uti iam coepimus experiri, praefectis datam potestatem corrigendi suos, maxime parvulos, qua antea erat penes solum P. Ministrus" (letter from Fr. Toncart, July 26, 1597, quoted above)). "P. Vice-Provin- (Letter from Fr. Toucart, July 26, 1597, quoted above). "P. Vice-Provin- potestatem habeant suos quibus praesunt, corrigendi pro defectibus" (letter from the same, December 4, 1597. "G. Ep.," XXXV., fol. 322).

[46] "Habeatur magna eius ratio quod talis sit communis usus Seminariorum quorum curam gerit Societas, ut non corripiantur pro delictis eb defectibus in scholis suis, nisi publice in scholis scandalose peccarent, ut si adversus praeceptorem scandalose protervi essent . . . Communiter autem remittantur corripiendi post lectiones ad Rectorem seu Praefectum Seminarii" (Fr. O. Manare, letter of June 19, 1594, quoted above).

[47] "Unum est quod Reverentia Vestra scire velim . . ., agi a Praefecto Studiorum ac praeceptoribus, ut nostri alumni indifferenter ut ceteri scholastici pro defectibus et negligentiis castigentur in scholis" (Fr. Foucart to the Assistent of Germany, 26th July, 1597; "G. Ep., XXXV., fol. 320). "Pater Vice-Provincialis (Fr. O. Manare) . . . ordinavit—de castigatione alumnorum in scholis nihil immutandum ab eo quod iam 'ante triennium' statuerat" (same to same, 4th December, 1597, quoted above).

AN OLD MIRACLE AND MODERN SCIENCE.

"IN THE city of Naples they believe in and support one of the wretchedest of all the religious impostures one can find in Italy—the miraculous liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius. Twice a year the priests assemble all the people at the Cathedral and get out this phial of clotted blood and let them see it slowly dissolve and become liquid; and every day for eight days this dismal farce is repeated, while the priests go among the crowd and collect money for the exhibition. The first day the blood liquefies in forty-seven minutes—the church is full then, and time must be allowed the collectors to get around; after that it liquefies a little quicker and a little quicker every day as the houses grow smaller, till on the eighth day, with only a few dozen present to see the miracle, it liquefies in four minutes." So wrote our amusing literary entertainer, Mark Twain.[1]

After careful inquiry and even personal observation, to judge from the details given, he calmly and conscientiously charges the venerable clergy and civic fathers of Naples with a wretched imposture done in the name of religion, and to mark his abhorrence of the whole performance and to incite in his numerous readers the same feeling he uses language the most insinuating and insulting at his fertile command. Before his time another literary star of a very different magnitude, "le savant et sage" Addison, testified: "I had twice an opportunity of seeing the operation of this pretended miracle, and must confess I think it is so far from being a real miracle that I look upon it as one of the most bungling tricks I ever saw,"[2] and Voltaire, taking a utilitarian view, remarks that though a false miracle and useless prodigy, it seems to keep those excitable people, the Neapolitans, in some restraint seeing such visible signs of their being under the hand of the Divinity. This observation excited one of his editors, M. Beuchot, to add sternly in a note that such superstitions were not as indifferent to him as to M. Voltaire, because the charlatan priest who works the fraud can excite at pleasure seditions among the people, and so place the government of Naples in subjection to the clergy.[3]

Another romancer, Dumas père, recounts in a style not surpassed by "Les Trois Mousquetaires" in interest, vivacity and inaccuracy as to facts, how the miracle was worked to order by command of the French General Championnet in 1799.[4] But why

1 "The Innocents Abroad," chap. xxix.

2 "Book of Travels Through Several Parts of Italy," etc., London, 1706.

3 "Essai sur les Moeurs de l'Italie," chap clxxxiii.

4 "Corricolo," Paris, 1865, Vol. I., p. 267.

enumerate here any more witnesses to the reality of the humbug? More must be summoned later, but leaving aside Voltaire as open to suspicion and Dumas as a mere writer of good copy, what abler judges could we have than Addison and Mark Twain, honorable men, and they have examined and pronounced condemnation? What remains to be said? It is true that men like Baronius,[5] Papebrock,[6] Vico,[7] Sir Humphrey Davy,[8] Hurter,[9] Fergola[10] saw it and marveled. It is true that for a "bungling trick" and "dismal farce" it has a very long run. It is true also that if it be an imposture, all the Archbishops and clergy of Naples for centuries and centuries have been rogues, and the Italian Church, and implicitly the whole Catholic Church, has tolerated for ages this outrage on God and humanity. Not one honest man among them to rise up, give away and denounce the fraud! It appears an interesting question, no matter how it is regarded, and as the writer happened to be in Naples last May he determined to linger there long enough to see "the miracle of St. Januarius" with his own eyes, to hear and to read all he conveniently could concerning this saint, who though dead yet speaketh, and concerning his mysterious blood, which seems to refuse to die. "*Ohne Glauben und ohne Unglauben*," like Hurter, neither believing nor disbelieving, but in a decidedly critical state of mind, he watched the "performance," made some inquiries, read a number of books and pamphlets and took a few notes, and now he lays the condensed results before his readers as a court of appeal, only asking—a superfluous asking—that judgment be suspended until the case has been stated and the final conclusion reached.

WHO WAS ST. JANUARIUS?

St. Januarius was Bishop of Benevento and was put to death under Diocletian in 305. The year of his birth is not known. Some acts of dubious critical value give it as 272. Tradition, supported by some very old statues, has always represented him as in the early bloom of manhood. His mother died a few days before

[5] "Annales," ad an. 305.

[6] Bollandists. Under date September 19; referred to afterwards by (B). They give about 130 pages to the saint and the miracle. Papebroch and Henschius were sent to Italy. Martii, tome I., p. 33.

[7] "Il Miracolo di S. Gennaro," 3 edit., Nap., 1903, p. 21.

[8] Dr. Weedall wrote letters from Naples to *The Catholic Mag. and Rev.*, 1831-32, p. 96. They are interesting and convincing. In "Davy's Life and Works," 9 vols. and 2 vols., edited by his brother, no mention of it occurs. It is said he requested permission to analyze it, and also that he had a leaning towards the miracle.

[9] Quoted later.

[10] "Historica Demonstratio," etc., Naples, 1634, pp. 3, 4.

his martyrdom, no mention being made of old age on her part. The saint was probably of noble extraction, as the address of his judge goes to prove, *audiens opinionem generis tui.* Until near 1632 there was no controversy about his birthplace having been Naples. The Bollandists accept it. In a sermon preached before a large crowd at Naples in that year, a "vir quidam religiosus" affirmed that Benevento was the saint's native city. "Quae" continues Caraccioli, "profecto acerba et auribus molestissima ἀντιστοιχία auditorum fremitum merito excitavit et paulo post amicorum hortatio me permovit ut furculum istum a majore planta divelleram.[11] So like many an author induced by his friends he published a work which fairly settled if it did not kill the doubt. He excused the preacher and put the blame on Paolo Regio,[12] that writer of lesser people and only in name royal, but otherwise plebeian in mind and style. Gentle amenities of literature! David Romano[13] adhered to Regio, and these two were the *puppis et prora* of the Beneventian opinion. One answer to an argument is characteristic of the time. Regio points to the house of the saint's mother still standing in Benevento. Caraccioli replies the house is not ancient enough. Even if it were, his mother may have lived there when her son was Bishop, but anyhow why was it not turned into a church, as was usual in those days? When Regio and Romano appealed to the custom of the early Church of appointing Bishops from the native clergy they had an argument of considerable force, but there were exceptions enough to weaken its strength.[14] The fact that Neapolitans claimed and obtained without any difficulty the body of the Bishop of Benevento while the remains of two of his subjects and fellow martyrs were carried to Benevento, their native city, is one of the strongest arguments in favor of Naples.[15]

HIS MARTYRDOM.

In 303 Diocletian, while in Nicomedia, issued an edict against the Christians, and Maximinian followed suit. Aulus Timotheus, appointed consul in succession to Dracontius in August, 305, came to Nola determined to persecute this *genus hominum superstitionis*

[11] "Le Vite de Sette Santi protettori si Napoli," Naples, 1579.

[12] "De Septem Sanctis patronis urbis Neapoletanic," 1571.

[13] Benevento itself had Greeks, Lombards, etc., for Bishops. St. Januarius II. B, of Benevento in 347, was from Africa. It is suggested the house may have been his. St. Paulinus of Nola was a Frenchman. B. Nov. I., p. 244.

[14] "Memorie sui Fatti della Vita—di S. Gennaro," by Raffale M. Coppola, Nap., 1857. He mentions a law of Augustus, confirmed by Diocletian, permitting the bodies of those condemned to death to be buried by their relations, the *familiare funus*, Lib. 9, de offic. Procons.

[15] "Roman Breviary," June 15, records similar ingratitude shown to St. Vitus by Diocletian.

novae et maleficae (Suetonius) to the utmost, and our saint, being conspicuous by his position and his intrepid assistance to the imprisoned faithful, among them his friend Sosius, was soon seized and brought before Timotheus at Nola, who declared he had heard the name of his family and exhorted him to sacrifice to the gods, threatening in case of refusal the cruelest tortures. In vain he raged and in vain he tortured. Cast into a fiery furnace, the Bishop came forth unhurt. Then he was racked and finally, along with Festus, his deacon, and Desiderius, his lector, both of Benevento, harnessed to a chariot, they drew their judge to Pozzuoli, and here they were put into a prison in which were the above mentioned Sosius, of Misena; Proculus, a deacon of Pozzuoli, and two laymen, Eutyches and Acutuius, all alike condemned *ad bestias.*

Next day they were exposed in the amphitheatre, but the wild animals forgot their ferocity and lay at the feet of the martyrs. Attributing this as usual to magic, Timotheus sentenced them to the axe, and the story runs that he was immediately struck blind, and so remained until St. Januarius by his prayers restored his sight. This miracle converted many of the bystanders, but their conversion alarmed the tyrant, fearful of losing the Emperor's favor, and he ungratefully ordered them to be executed.[16] They were led to the Solfatara, and there gave their lives for their faith in the crucified God. The ruins of the amphitheatre are still extensive, and both they, and especially the Solfatara, the *Forum Vulcani* of Strabo, are interesting on many accounts. Some acts state that on the same day the cruel judge, Timotheus, suffered fearful torments and cried again and again: "O, miserable me, how I am tortured on account of that servant of God, Januarius!" and soon died.[17] There is doubtless some of the "luxuriant mediæval vegetation" about many of the acts of this saint, but it is sufficient for our purpose to point out that on good historic grounds it can be accepted as a fact that St. Januarius, Bishop of Benevento, was put to death as a Christian at the Solfatara about the year 305.

BURIAL AND TRANSLATIONS.

He was buried not far from the scene of his conflict, between the Solfatara and the sea at a place then called Marcion's farm, where now stands a church in the saint's name and a convent inhabited by Capuchins. According to Tutini,[18] in 325 or later,

[16] Taken mainly from the "Roman Breviary," September 19. Disputed points are mostly omitted or only conclusions given in the historical part of this account, and only interesting or important authorities given.

[17] Tutini, "Memorie istoriche della vita e culto di S. Gianuario," 1633, ed. 1710.

[18] Caraccioli, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

according to the Bollandists in 381, his remains were solemnly transferred by Bishop John, or Saint Severus, to a church built close to the walls of Naples and near that of St. Fortunatus. Here it remained until shortly after 817, when Sico, Duke of Benevento, having besieged Naples apparently without decisive result, took the martyr's body, in those days no mean prize, and withdrew to his own city *onustus tamen sacra et invidenda praeda.*[19] Quite a difference between this Duke and one of his later successors, Talleyrand! The church in which the body was kept becoming old and dilapidated, it was transferred in 1129 under Gualter, Archbishop of Tarentino, then also ruler of Benevento, to the new church erected by himself for the Saints Festus and Desiderius. During the same stormy century, under either Frederick Barbarossa or his successor, the body was secretly conveyed to the abbey of Monte Vergine and there interred in the centre of the church and a high altar constructed over the spot for greater security, and then it seems it was gradually lost sight of until John (Cardinal), of Arragon, who held the abbey *in commendam*, wished to renovate the church, and the high altar having been removed from the centre, the relics were found. Soon after John died, and Cardinal Oliver Carafa had the abbey, to whom King Ferdinand wrote asking the body to be restored to Naples. After much delay, owing to wars, Pope Alexander VI. gave Alexander Carafa, Archbishop of Naples and Oliver's brother, permission to remove the body, which was done January 13, 1497, and the plague then raging at Naples ceased.

ANCIENT AUTHORITIES.

The name of St. Januarius, Bishop and martyr, is found in the "Life of St. Paulinus of Nola," a client of his, who died in 431, written in 432 by the priest Uranius. The martyrologies of Jerome and of Carthage of the fifth century mention him and those of Ado, Notker and Usuard. Martyrologies, as well known, give only dates and place of suffering, and not the details. Venerable Bede, who sleeps in such simple state in Durham's wondrous fane, gives his eulogium ad 13 kal. oct. The Greek Menologium, compiled in the tenth century by order of the Emperor Basil, honors the saint and his companions on the same day, September 19. The Greeks had special reverence for Januarius. There are numerous Acta, the principal being those used by the Bollandists, which are very probably the most ancient, dating from about the end of the fourth century, as the first translation of the holy Bishop's remains, *i. e.*, from near the Solfatara to the neighborhood of the city, had not yet taken place: the Acta Bonensiana, whose claims to priority were so stoutly

[19] "Vindiciae-Actor, Bonoru," S. Jan., Nap., 1759.

maintained by Mazzocchi;[20] the Acta Vaticana, or Baroniana, and others.[21] John the Deacon, a Neapolitan and historian of the Bishops of Naples, wrote some during the tenth century. There is some disagreement among many of these authorities as to the month in which the saint suffered, but at present in Naples the celebration in September is in honor of his death, that of May in remembrance of the translation, and on December the 16th is the feast of his patronage. Of later mentions no need to speak, nor of the numerous lives and discussions concerning the miracle, enough to form a small library.

HONORS PAID THE SAINT.

The high esteem and great affection in which the Neapolitans have always held their renowned patron, and his favors to them in return are abundantly shown by many public and historical monuments. Apart from the church erected over his tomb near the Forum Vulcani, and a second near the city to which his remains were removed, there was a third in the city called St. Januarius in Diaconia, and later often ad Ulmum, built as early as 680. Here John the Deacon was stationed. A fourth with the dramatic name (but prosaic explanation) St. Januarius spolians mortuos in vico Judaeorum is now called St. Mary of the Angels. A chapel stands on the hill Antignano commonly spoken of as S. Gennarello al Vomero, and there is a second one near by containing the stone upon which the saint's head was carried from the Solfatara district. Near Torre del Greco a church was erected in 1632 in gratitude for deliverance from injury during the eruption of Mount Vesuvius the year preceding. At Capo di Monte there is a little chapel. In the surrounding districts there are churches and chapels, and in the city itself many statues and other monuments to the saint, while medals have also been struck from time to time in his honor, some of which with Latin and Greek inscriptions go back one thousand years.[22] In 1738 the Order of St. Januarius was instituted by

[20] Falconio gives many acts, etc., in his large work, "L'Intera Istoria del glorioso Martira S. Gennaro, Intera." Indeed, starting from Janus the two-faced and bringing in Javan, son of Japhet, from whom he traces the Januarian families. Having finished this learned, laborious and useless task, he writes with complacency: "Avendo scorso un pelago d'oscurissime antichità. Non sommersivi come gli altro." Yet his book is useful.

[21] Tutini claims earliest medals to be of 660, which Mabillon and the Bollandists contest. The Bollandists omit one of the two chapels on the hill Antignano.

[22] Not the first of the name, as there was another so called, dating back to the building of the present cathedral, in the early fourteenth century. "Eccoci alla famosissima Capella detta del Tesoro, superbo e non perituro monumento della magnificenza de'Napoletani e loro piissimo affetto verso

Charles III., and the first cavaliers named were the Emperors of Austria and of Russia, the Kings of France, Bavaria, Denmark, Prussia, Sardinia, Saxony, etc.

The Cathedral itself, dedicated to Our Lady, was often called by his name, and is so still in many guide books, though there is no proof that it was ever dedicated to the saint. But in it are two chapels in his honor. One commonly called the *sub-corpus*, or *succorpo*, under the high altar, is a beautiful piece of work designed by Thomas Malvita di Como. The floor, ceiling, altars, statues and stairs are in Parian marble, and here lies in a bronze sarcophagus the body of the saint since 1506. The other, called "The Treasury of St. Januarius," is the fourth on your left as you enter the main door, and this is one of the richest and finest chapels in the world.[23] Vowed by the city in 1527, it was not begun until 1608, according to the plans of Grimaldi the Theatine. Artists vied with one another to be employed in its adorning. Many a strange story is told of them and their rivalry. Guido had to flee for his life on account of the Greek, Belisar Conenzio, likewise the Chevalier l'Arpino, while poor Dominichino was said to have died of chagrin over a trick played by a bribed workman so that his frescoes might quickly fade. The magnificent bronze gates are by Fansaga. The interior, with its seven fine altars, its precious marbles, its numerous glistening silver statues, its glowing frescoes, lofty and elegant ceiling, forms a gorgeous picture, and here behind the high altar, in two niches closed with solid silver doors, are preserved the head of the saint and the phials containing the world-famed and much discussed blood. Let us call it blood for the present. Even if it be not blood, it is one of the strangest and most puzzling substances in the world. And now, having seen briefly the historical view of the saint and of his cult, an attempt will be made to state clearly how the case concerning the head and blood stands at present, giving the main points in its history, the principal phenomena and the corresponding scientific difficulties.

"IL MIRACOLO DI SAN GENNARO."

What is the miracle? When a phial containing, it is said, his

S. Gennaro. E. Meritamente fu addimandata del Tesoro ove si consideri che, a prescindere della prodigiosa quantità che vi si serba di gioie, di vasi sacri d'oro e d'argento, di statue e busti d'argento e di sontuosi apparati necessarii al divin culto, evvi il deposito del prodigioso sangue e del Capo del Santo Vescovo, prezioso tesoro, perenne fonte dal quale tutte le grazie fluiscono che. Dio giornalmente si degna concedere a questa popolosa e cospicua Metropoli ad intercessione di si gran Protettore!"—"Notizie del Bello, dell'Antico e del Curioso di Napoli," by Carlo Celano, edit. by G. B. Chiarmi, Nap., 1856.

[23] The account of the money paid "to our well beloved, our royal goldsmith," is still preserved in Reg. Ann. 130, fol. 115.

own blood is presented to the head of St. Januarius, the blood, dry and hard in appearance, becomes liquid; hence the expression the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius.

STORY OF THE HEAD AND BLOOD.

At what date the head was first preserved separately from the body is not known. Probably, as customary, it was buried with the body. At the removal of the latter to the new church outside the walls it may have been brought to the principal church of the city. There is no doubt but that when Duke Sico took the body to Benevento the head remained in Naples. In 1305 or 6 Charles II., of Anjou, a "pious and religious King," as Chioccarelli terms him, caused a life-sized bust of silver, gilt, to be made, in which was inclosed the saint's skull, and in this it has ever since reposed.[24] That it was the custom of Christians to gather the blood of martyrs we know from history and the little crystal bottles so often found in the Catacombs. Who gathered our saint's blood is unknown, though, according to one tradition, it was his old nurse, and according to another, a devout woman of Naples. At first likely buried (B), the blood was afterwards preserved along with the head, but there is no documentary reference to it until the year 1140, when the "Chronicle of Maraldus" records that King Roger of Sicily visited Naples and saw the miracle.[25] In the fifteenth century Lupo di Specchio told the story of St. Peregrinus, so named probably from his numerous pilgrimages, who was at Naples between 1100 and 1120 and mentions the blood, which is spoken of also in connection with the visits of Charles I. at the end of the thirteenth and Charles II. at the beginning of the fourteenth century. A manuscript of 1399 speaks of a chapel wherein were guarded the head and blood. The Journal of Julian Passero narrates that October 6, 1496, the blood was fluid like water, and Robert Gaguin, or the author of "Les Chroniques de France," describes how Charles VIII. "Dimanche Troisième jour du Mois de Mai ouit sa messe à Sainet Genny" and saw the liquefied blood. Mulcassen, Bey of Tunis, saw it in 1547 and became a convert. To Baronius it was a standing miracle, and Benedict XIV. defends it as a true and great miracle which has not one or two witnesses, but all Italy, or, more correctly, the whole Christian world. It would be tedious to enumerate all the sovereigns and eminent men who have seen it and have been impressed by it. In our own times it was observed by Victor Emmanuel, the Emperor of Russia (in

[24] Butler's "Lives of the Saints," September 19.

[25] St. Peregrinus was the son of St. Margaret of Scotland and Malcolm III., the king who punished Macbeth.

1873), Pope Pius IX., King Humbert and Queen Marguerite, ex-Queen Natalie of Servia, Queen Amalie of Portugal, etc.

TIME OF THE FIRST LIQUEFACTION.

When the blood first liquefied is not known with certainty. There is a tradition declaring that when the remains were taken in solemn procession from the Solfatara to Naples, the woman who had gathered the martyr's blood, or a descendant of hers, offered to the Bishop the phial which had been preserved in her home.[26] This presentation took place on the hill of Antignano, and as soon as the phial was brought near the relics the dry blood immediately liquefied and bubbled. In memory of this a church was built on the spot, and on its walls there is a tablet, erected or renewed in the seventeenth century, which commemorates the miracle. The first author apparently who mentions this meeting and liquefaction is Paolo Reggio, who wrote in 1571, and he cites no documentary authority. If the miracle took place then and there, it is rather strange, seeing that liquefactions of the blood of saints, though known, are very rare, that the Acts and early homilies in honor of the saint omit such a remarkable occurrence.[27] An eulogium written in or before the ninth century mentions it not, neither does John the Deacon, who, writing in the same age, brings his account down to 872. This omission is a great obstacle to the acceptance of the tradition, yet it can be said that otherwise the tradition has some points in its favor.[28] There are grounds for placing it about the eleventh century, and not later, if we accept the life of St. Peregrinus mentioned before, which states that when this saint visited Naples, 1100 to 1120, the miracle was then well known, and some authors quote the "Chronicle of Maraldus" as authority for the statement that King Roger in 1140 declared he came to Naples after his coronation not so much to receive the homage of his subjects as to venerate the *redivivus sanguis* so well known even in distant lands.[29] Moreover, there is such a noted increase in devotion to St. Januarius about the eleventh and twelfth centuries,

[26] Caraccioli writes of an antique image of a woman with an ampulla over the door of the old Church of St. Januarius, near the city.

[27] Tutini, Summonte ("Historia della Citta di Napoli," 1675), Capaccio ("Neapolitanae Historiae," t. I., p. 760, Naples, 1607).

[28] "The Breve Chronicon Monasterii St. Stephani de Nemore," attributed to Maraldus, is listed among opacryphul or dubuious ones by Barth. Capasso in his "Le Fonti della Storia delle Provincie Napolitane dal 568-1500," Naples, 1902, p. 90.

[29] In the ninth century St. Januarius was not the principal patron, though he is mentioned alone in the sixth by Peter the Notary, but he is in the twelfth. Beneficed priests had to visit yearly the *limina Beati Januarie.*—Il Formulario of Archbishop Umberto, of date 1308.

during which the Cathedral was called after him, that it can be attributed to some striking manifestation of his power.[30] During these centuries Naples produced no chroniclers or historians, and it is noteworthy that no later writers till Reggio attempt to specify the time when the liquefactions began. It is reasonable to conclude that this peculiar phenomenon has been occurring for nigh a thousand years at least.

WHERE THE HEAD AND BLOOD ARE PRESERVED.

Sunk in the thickness of the solid external wall behind the high altar in the chapel of St. Januarius commonly called Il Tesoro, there are two cupboards side by side, but not communicating with one another and having no opening but the doors. Each measures about three feet four inches in height, two feet in width and sixteen inches in depth. The walls are covered with damask and are of wood (colored marble, Professor Punzo) except the dividing one between the two, which is of metal, and the flooring of silver. The doors of silver have each two strong locks, four in all, of which one is in the upper part and one in the lower part of each door. The keys, four in number, are kept, the two for the upper locks in the custody of the Archbishop, the two for the lower in the custody of the representatives of the city, whose president is always the Mayor. In the cupboard or recess to the left as you face the wall is the bust of St. Januarius, in the head of which is his skull or its bones; in the other to the right is a case made of silver and glass containing the two ampullae or phials. This reliquary is circular in form, somewhat resembling an extra large flat watch case, with a width of about five inches and a depth of two, and has glass behind and before. On the top, where the ring of a watch would be, there is an ornamental projection surmounted by an elliptical crown with a crucifix rising up through it. On the opposite side is a hollow cylindrical handle about six inches long and one in diameter, by which the reliquary is carried in the hands or set in a rich silver stand like an ostensorium or monstrance when it is to be placed on the altar or carried in procession. This reliquary or *teca*, as it is often called, is thought to have been presented also by Charles II. of Anjou, or by his son Robert, as the workmanship is of that period and it bears the royal arms.

The phials are of crystal and like those gathered from martyrs' tombs or like the lachrymatories of the ancients. They are kept in an upright position by being fixed at the ends in a glue of a lemon color, and each phial is so closed that when the liquid fills

[30] The opinion that the blood was buried with the body, but removed at least before Duke Sico's attack in 817, has great probability.

the phial or it is inverted not a drop can escape. The smaller phial is round in form and measures say three inches in length and less than two-thirds of an inch in diameter. The larger one, in shape like a flattened pear, is about three inches and a half in length, two inches in width and perhaps an inch where thickest.[31] They are plain except for a slight wavy ring of glass around the neck of both, and around the smaller one a little lower down four straighter rings extra. The phials are about half an inch from the glass sides of the case, so they do not touch them at all; neither do they touch the silver part, except maybe at the top and bottom. The glass sides have plain surfaces, as can be seen by turning the case, because the phials retain to the eye their size and form.

EXPOSITION OF THE RELICS.

On the Saturday preceding the first Sunday in May, 1904, at noon a representative of the Archbishop and one of the city met before the recesses, each bearing a gold embroidered velvet bag containing two keys, one for each door. The bust was first taken out, placed at the Gospel side of the altar and clothed by the chaplains with very costly episcopal vestments—mitre, stole, cape, chain and cross—and then it was carried in procession to the Church of Santa Chiara and there deposited on the same side of the high altar. About 5 in the evening the other recess was opened with the same precautions and the reliquary carried in solemn procession by the Metropolitan Chapter, arrayed in full canonical robes, and the chaplains of the "Treasury," clad in their official garments, accompanied by the body of noble deputies, members of religious congregations, etc., preceded by about fifty groups of four men carrying on elevated platforms the silver statues or busts of the principal patron saints of the city, through the decorated and crowded streets to the same grand old Church of St. Clare, whose corner-stone was laid by King Robert in 1310. There, amidst a crowd that overflowed into every nook and cranny of the building, each statue was brought and paused for a moment as in homage before the right regal looking bust of St. Januarius, and at each pause a versicle and response were chanted. It was impressive. The statues are remarkably lifelike and striking in their attitudes and varied picturesque habits or vestments, and as they come in sight, gleaming high over the heads of the multitude, the verse of the Hebrew Psalmist would come unbidden to mind: *Nimis honorati sunt amici tui Deus*, and the words of the Magnificat, *exultavit humiles*, were

[31] Boldetti, "Osservazioni Sopria i Sagri Cimiteri," p. 155, has an engraving very like this large phial.

illustrated even on earth, for truly it was an exaltation of the humble. St. Januarius was holding court. It makes a splendid scene and leaves a lifelong remembrance. Finally the reliquary came in sight last of all, borne in the hands of the Archbishop, Cardinal Prisca, who slowly made his way through the fast filling sanctuary and by the Royal Cuirassiers in brazen helmets, who with drawn swords kept order, and up the steps to the altar, where, turning around and holding the teca up, he showed the blood to the people. It was hard and dry. Then prayers were said by the clergy and the Cardinal held the case slightly elevated, now and then almost inverting it, while an attendant at times held up a single candle to enable him to see if the hard mass showed any sign of change. No sign yet. More prayers are recited by the priests, while *la gente* of St. Januarius raised their voices in still higher invocations. An indescribable air of expectancy pervaded the whole vast assemblage and kept them gazing as one man on the relic in the hands of the Archbishop. Suddenly he looks closer, and lo! the mass is moving. It is liquid, bubbling. A sigh of relief and joy escapes from the crowd. Once more St. Januarius has manifested his power, and now the triumphant "Te Deum" rings out through the lofty vaulted church. The Cardinal kisses the reliquary and those around press closely. Bishops, canons, chaplains, laymen, natives and strangers, all mixed, and all seemingly without exception salute the fluid blood, and the people outside the rails come in turn, all anxious to have the same privilege. About 9 o'clock the solemn procession winds its way back through the crowded and joyous streets to the Cathedral, and the bust and the phials are restored carefully and according to rules in vogue for a couple of centuries to their honored tabernacles.[32]

Naturally such a sight, so historic, solemn and unusual, may fill the spectator's mind and interfere some with critical observation; but the succeeding day, Sunday, in the Cathedral, and during the remainder of the octave in the chapel itself, the exposition takes place, and consequently an abundance of opportunities is offered to every one. The writer went twice more to see the liquefaction in the morning and once towards evening to see the way of pro-

[32] The chapel of the treasury being civic property, Pope Innocent X. sent, in 1647, a delegate, afterwards Clement X., to draw up a compact regulating the rights of the Archbishop and of the city, and making regulations regarding the number and ceremonies of the expositions. Ten Neapolitan nobles, with two representatives elected by the city, constituted the civic deputies of the chapel. They are now appointed by the king, and likewise the chaplains, twelve in number. Before the exposition an exhibition is held in the sacristy of the chalices, crowns, mitres, etc., presented in honor of the saint by Popes, kings and others. One mitre contains 3,325,168 rubies and 188 emeralds.—Sperindeo.

cedure. A crowd every morning and all during the day some people going and coming, and all who wish may approach to see or to kiss the relic. Each morning as a rule the blood is hard, and the liquefaction occurs again. The time required on Saturday was five minutes; on the second occasion, seven, and on the third twenty. But there are other phenomena connected with this marvelous phial which are more astonishing than the liquefaction itself, and other particulars which increase to thoughtful people the intensely interesting character of this "wonder" of St. Januarius. Before passing to their narration a word about an adjunct to the exposition which receives an unfriendly attention out of all proportion to its importance.

THE WOMEN—PRAYING OR CURSING?

The following is representative of one set of critics: "C'était quelque chose de hideux que ces vingt ou trente mégères arrachant leur bonnet de rage; menaçant S. Janvier du poing, invectivant leur parent de toute la force de leur poumons, hurlant les injures les plus grossièeres, vociférant les menaces les plus terribles, insultant le saint sur son autel, comme une populace ivre eût pu faire d'un parricide sur unechafaud."[33] This is from Dumas, of course, who sought dramatic effect at all costs. In contrast with the Gallic romancer, a Teutonic witness, Hurter, calmly assures us there was nothing disrespectful either in tones or words or gestures, and Dr. Weedall and Waterton bear the same testimony. He saw, as any large-hearted, well informed man would see, something touching in the steadfast claim and joy of these poor people to be connected in some particular way with their great patron and the protector of Naples.[34] Perhaps Postel explains correctly the genesis of the inaccurate view in a careless or prejudiced mind when, writing about these women, who are termed *la gente di S. Gennaro*, and who maintain, according to some, that they are descended from the old paralytic cured by the saint, or, according to others, from his relations who buried the martyr at night near the Solfatara and preserved the phials of his blood, he says: "Ce peuple si expressif dans toutes les circonstances de la vie commune, s'exalte et se surpasse ici lui-même; la singuliére animation du visage, de la parole et des gestes inexplicable pour les natures froides du Nord ou pour l'insensibilité des âmes sans religion, ont donné lieu sans doute à cettle fable des femmes insultant S. Janvier pour obtenir son

[33] *Op. cit.*, p. 226.
[34] "Geburt und Wiedergeburt," 1846, Vol. II., p. 552.

Miracle quand il tarde à exaucer leurs voeux et lui prodiguant les plus vulgaires épithètes."[35]

All the writer saw and heard was this: Eight or ten women, some old, some young, assembled near the side of the sanctuary rail on the right hand, who commenced to pray long before the procession came, reciting the ordinary prayers and litanies, which they kept up continuously, every now and then raising the fallen pitch of their somewhat harsh voices. As they used the Neapolitan dialect, it is difficult for strangers to understand them, and of course they prayed with an earnestness and an animation which we seldom display and with an utter, most admirable indifference to what onlookers might think, which we do not possess. Otherwise there was nothing remarkable about them. It can be admitted that thoughtless strangers to all Italy might be somewhat deceived, and one could easily believe that if the miracle were long delayed the women might so gesticulate and shout out their prayers as to transgress the bounds of respect observed among us, but never, it may be added, could they go the length of camp meeting scenes. As it was, these good women unconsciously formed a picturesque enough part of the scene, and heaven forbid that our stiff formality should ever paralyze any children of the Sunny South.

PRESENCE OF "HERETICS."

A word may as well be added here about some of the wild stories told of how non-Catholics were roughly driven from the chapel in earlier times, when the liquefaction was long delayed. There is this much truth in them, that under two circumstances such were sometimes requested to retire: first, when after several hours the miracle did not take place, and, secondly, when the liquefied blood became suddenly concrete. The writer knows of no such request within many years. St. Januarius thus shows himself, according to Putignano, *accerimus religionis propugnator*, refusing communion with the enemies of the faith and in their presence sad and indignant. If, notwithstanding their presence, the blood liquefied, he has reasons ready, either God wished to attract them to the true faith or, if obstinate themselves, relating their experience to their friends, they might scatter good seed bearing in time good fruit.[36] Witnesses, indeed, both in the past and present, have submitted to the Church. If witnesses who write were less prejudiced, and to put it bluntly, more truthful, their readers might not indeed believe,

[35] "Le Miracle de Saint Janvier à Naples," Paris, 1857, p. 289. Consulted very frequently. The prayers said by priests and people are generally the Pater, Ave, Credo, Miserere, Athanasian Creed, etc.

[36] Putignano, "De Redivivo Sanguine," Nap., 1723, Vol. I., p. 2.

but the erroneous and contemptuous ideas concerning the wonder of Naples and the whole method of procedure would not be so prevalent. For his part the writer thinks the ceremonies are carried out with great decorum, solemnity and courtesy, and at no time did he see any collection of money in connection with them.

THE APPEARANCE OF THE BLOOD.

In the small phial there are visible only two or three dark stains on the inside.[37] They may be caused by very small pieces of sponge once saturated with the martyr's blood. That sponges, etc., were used to gather the blood and afterwards were inclosed in such bottles, and these were inserted in the fresh mortar near the head on the outside of the tombs, we know from St. Prudentius' hymn in honor of St. Vincent and from the Catacombs. Boldetti found one in 1714, broke it in removing it from the mortar and a sponge was within. Leibnitz made some trials on blood so found in St. Callixtus' Cemetery to see if any earth or any spices or balm were mixed with it, but he found no traces of any other substance.[38] Few writers mention any phenomenon in connection with the small phial, so it can be passed by the more readily, as the old martyrologies and breviaries generally speak of only one, and one is all that is represented in the more ancient paintings, images, etc.

As people generally speak of the phials, *i. e.*, in the plural, the liquefaction is also frequently spoken of as if it occurred in both; but we think this is not to be taken literally. It may be remarked that some authors mention one as filled with clear blood and the other with blood mixed with some dust, probably from the Solfatara, the place of execution.[39] This second is, in all likelihood, the large one which we observe to be a little more than half full of a dark reddish, slightly mottled solid mass of a slightly grainy appearance in texture. Pastel gives it: "du couleur brune, coagulé, dur, collé aux parois." It has been observed once or so yellow, black in upper part and ashy looking in lower. Dr. Pietro Punzo described a part which adhered to the glass as "giallo bruno e striato in rosse in varii punti."[40] In May, 1710, on the fifth day of the octave, it

[37] The contents of this phial are said to have been sent to Madrid centuries ago.

[38] Boldetti, *op. cit.*, p. 97. Christians wrapped the dead in aromatic cloths and put sweet-smelling spices in the tombs.

[39] John Rho, S. J., alone, perhaps, has *paleaque de qua praedixi satis conspicua.* (B)

[40] "Indagini ed Osservazioni sulla Teca di S. G.," Nap., 1890. Professor S. de Luca, a so-called rationalist, had made observations, etc., but died a believer before he could publish them. This was done by Professor Pietro Punzo, both, to judge from the book, cool, scientific men.

[41] "Vita Bollandi," Mar., t. I., p. 33.

was of a somewhat ashy color, which it retained until September, but when taken out it regained its original color in a few hours. "Solutus subniger e rubeo vergens—opaque, color of roasted coffee, are also descriptions. It is all of the same density, and the color is uniform throughout, no separation of serum and crassamentum visible. In judging of the color it must be borne in mind that it is seen first through a glass made somewhat dim by many lips and much rubbing—it is rubbed before presentation to each individual to kiss—and through the crystal of the phial itself, sometimes not in the clearest light. To sum up, it is reasonable to admit that at rare times the color has changed, but as a rule it is dark red with yellowish white pin spots in it, and generally brighter looking when liquid. There are no stained glass windows in the chapel.

CONDITION WHEN EXPOSED.

Generally the blood is hard, yet not always so. John Rho, S. J., who saw it in 1628 and privately in 1643, says it was not arid, but concrete; when the ampulla was inclined it did not adhere to the sides, but the whole mass moved (B). Papebrock describes it in 1661 as "per grumos concretum ac fere instar arenae humidioris."[41] From the diary of the chapel, begun in 1659, we learn that sometimes it is hard, very hard, partly liquefied or totally so. The rule is that it is hard when exposed.

USUAL CONDITIONS OF LIQUEFACTION.

It is brought into the vicinity and view of the head and held at a distance varying from about four feet to six or seven while waiting for the change. So far as the writer knows the bust containing the head is completely closed so that its gilt silver plate is always between the two, while in the recess there is in addition the dividing wall. As the priest holding the reliquary stands facing the people at the centre of the altar and sometimes turns partly around, it can happen that his arm or his person intervenes between the two, his arm, because he holds the teca by the stem and frequently places the fingers of his other hand lightly on the crucifix on top for greater security, especially when inclining the teca. He never touches the circular part of the reliquary or the glass, much less does he rub, or chafe, or shake it.[42] As the blood has been found liquid, this presence of the head is not essential.[43] We read, more-

[42] Such as have not seen, or if they have and still speak of such manipulations, are, in Hurter's words, "die schändlicksten lüger." *Op. cit.*, p. 552.

[43] Mabillon and Middleton must be classed together here. One in his "Letter from Rrome" (ed. 1742, p. 208), and the other in his "Museum Italicum" (t. I., p. 105), speaks of the liquefaction in such a way as to show they either have not seen it or confound it with some other liquefaction.

over, that the Church of St. John the Baptist, commonly called San Giovanna Maggiore, had a relic of our saint—a part of a bone—and once an altar was erected outside the church and the relic placed thereon so that when the procession passed the blood was in view, whereupon it immediately liquefied. As this anticipation caused discontent, the exposure of the relic was forbidden. When Charles, Duke of Nevers, afterwards of Mantua, took the teca in his hands the liquefaction occurred, though the Archbishop had refused to allow the head to be exposed. The blood has been known to harden suddenly under the kiss of some persons.

TIME REQUIRED.

No definite time is required. It occurs in from one minute to several hours. In May, 1835, there was no liquefaction. In the two years, 1527 and 1528, there was none whatever, and in 1678 two days passed before it occurred, while in 1556 it remained liquid. Hence the absurdity of hostile or careless writers declaring "the miracle happened sooner than expected," "before the time," "at the hour appointed," etc.

THE BEGINNING OF THE LIQUEFACTION.

It is important to note that the liquefaction does not begin at any point and then gradually spread. It starts all round, and generally is instantaneous throughout. Dr. Pietro Punzo compares the beginning as he saw it to the manner in which solid paraffin would melt if immersed in something warm. It has been observed with only the middle portion liquid, and at least once (December 16, 1702) only a drop or two, which ran over the hard surface of the remainder. These are rare phases. When liquefied it may have the consistency of honey or may be as fluid as ether.

AN ACCOMPANIMENT TO THE LIQUEFACTION.

At the time of liquefaction bubbles are generally, not always, observed on the surface and through the mass, and sometimes it has, as it were, a very slight spongy appearance. Bubbles the size of a pea, declares Punzo, now few, now many, and united like foam. The writer noticed this foamy phenomenon on the surface and perhaps through the body. Baronius speaks of the ebullition. "Ebullit," writes Putignano, and adds, "saepe bullae quaedam in superficie ebullitionem praeveniunt." *Il Mattino*, of Naples, for September 21, 1904, reports: "Il sangue prezioso del Santo Patrono si liquefece ribollendo nelle ampolle senza praesentare nessun globulo, nessun grumo." Postel gives this description: "Tout à

coup à un instant ou à l'autre le sang se met à bouilloner. Vous l'aviez vu il n'y a que peu de secondes, sec, reserré, dur, et coagulé: le voici qui s'agite doucement, se liquéfie, etend son volume, bouillone et remplit entièrement les ampoules." These last words bring to mind:

INCREASE AND DECREASE.

A most peculiar phenomenon is connected with this strange phial of blood. When it liequefies it increases in volume! It is not simply a passing increase due to the ebullition, if the latter occurs, but an increase which remains while liquid and when it re-coagulates, because when brought out liquid or solid next morning the increase is still there. At the next liquefaction it increases a little more, and so on until at the end of the week, and sometimes sooner, the phial is filled, and so filled at times that the liquefaction can only be ascertained by the closest observation. This increase takes place generally during the May exposition. In September it commences to decrease bit by bit until by the end of the week the phial is once more about half full. In this augmentation of volume, as in all the other phenomena, no absolute regularity can be expected. On May 11, 1902, there was a sudden reduction, and in September, 1870, on the first day, the usual reduction was observed, and then began an increase which remained the rest of the week. Sometimes on the same day both increase and decrease have been observed, and sometimes the phial remained full for several days. In September, 1879, taken out with the same volume as when put away in May, *i. e.*, completely filled, it liquefied in a few moments and resumed its original volume, and during the octave, though liquefying, no augmentation was observed. No mention occurs of any diminution below the normal half-filled condition of the phial.

THE GLOBO.

When the liquefaction takes place there remains very often in the centre of the liquid a portion undissolved which is commonly called the *Globo*, and which resembles a round nut, and as far as the writer remembers it did not follow in shape the configuration of the lower part of the ampulla, *i. e.*, the liquefaction did not extend from the circumference inwards in precisely equal distances all round from the crystal. This globo manifests the same variety as the other phenomena.

Sometimes it is present, sometimes not; now large, now small. It may remain the whole day, and sometimes when the teca is

exposed next morning the parts liquefied and solid are the same. The irregularities of this globo increase the difficulty of any explanation. It may be remarked that perhaps only one writer, Dr. Punzo, asserts that once he observed a portion of the liquid substance adhering to the side of the phial at its reposition in the evening, though in the morning it had not done so. The writer noticed the absence of any adhesion, and nearly all authors, he thinks, make special mention of its absence.

OPPORTUNITY OF OBSERVATION.

"Mais cette ceremonie se fait avec tant de précautions et on tient le peuple si écarté qu'à peine peut-on rien voir!"[44] so cries one in your left ear, while in your right you hear "J'étais a côté même du prêtre, qui tenait le reliquaire."[45] Strangers, if in time, can get good positions. Hurter was astonished at the freedom permitted indiscriminately to the crowd. The writer, like Dr. Weedall, was close to the Cardinal in the Church of St. Clare, and in the chapel he watched the opening of the two doors, looked in the recesses and stood close to the Monsignore who held the reliquary and the representative of the city, the Duke of Bagnoli, both of whom were very courteous and gave every reasonable opportunity to observe and to question. Many strangers, both Protestant and Catholic, were present and approached as freely as Neapolitans. When some foreign ladies did not draw near to the sanctuary rail, yet showed by their manner their desire to see, the chaplains very often and very kindly held the teca up higher and forward to afford a better view.[46] Scientific men have been granted every opportunity, short of opening the case, to handle and to examine it, as we shall presently see. "There is no attempt whatever to conceal or make a mystery of the proceeding. Quite the contrary."[47] Once it was customary to carry the head and blood to the various *sedilia* of the city,[48] and even into the houses of the great when sick. Nothing could be simpler and more above board than the whole proceeding. The frankness displayed, the utter absence of any reserve make upon all intelligent visitors a deep and lasting impression.

---

[44] Malte Brun, "Voy. en France en Italie," etc., t. III., let. 92, Apud Postel, 295.

[45] Lalande, "Voy. d'un Français en Italie," 1768, Vol. VII.

[46] ". . . de grandes Anglaises blondes s'avançaient jusque sur l'autel et se penchaient curieusement afin d'examiner avec leur lorgnons."—Valéry, "Voy. hist. et litter.," t. III., p. 322.

[47] Sir George Grove's description, 1869, in Murray's "Handbook for Southern Italy'," ed. 1890.

[48] Sedilia or Seggie, the five political divisions of Naples, called Capuan, Porta Nuova, etc., from places near where the citizens met. Exposition was often in the open air.

EXPLANATIONS.

If the liquefaction be such a miserable trick, it is truly odd how long a time passes before a satisfactory exposure or even a good imitation can be made. The miracle is repeated eighteen times a year, *i. e.*, nine in May, eight in September and once on December 16. Thousands of strangers have seen it, hundreds of books and pamphlets and letters have been written about it. Several imitations have been made, successfully 'tis said, and again and again have men come forward to show how it is done, and men of science have made many experiments, but the imitations die aborning, the explanations fall short, the experiments fail, and at the dawn of the twentieth century, in the rich and cultured old city of Parthenope, that *fragmentum de coelo delapsum,* in Mabillon's words, where reign, said Maro, *ver perpetuum et alienis mensis aectas,* this matter *lapidescens potius quam coagulata,* said to be the blood of a martyr of the dawn of the fourth century, liquefies and manifests life when brought in sight of the head of the heroic Bishop in whose veins it once coursed, as if, says Baronius, it rejoiced to approach the martyr crowned head and recognizing the font whence it flowed and impatient of the resurrection's delay, would fain hasten to reanimate it once more.

Peter Molinaeus, a Calvinist, believed that some water and lime were introduced into the reliquary, and when mixed heat enough was developed to liquefy the blood. How were they introduced when so public? In the spirit of the Magdeburg Centuriators, Peter replies: "By the aid of the devil." Why, then, sometimes no liquefaction? Because sometimes the devil cannot work miracles on account of the presence of pious people; and if we ask how could pious people be in such a city as Naples? Peter would modestly answer that he himself or others of his persuasion might be present.[49] There is an additional touch of comedy in this reasoning when we recall that the presence of such heretics as Peter and his friends has often been regarded by the Neapolitans as the reason why the saint refused to work his miracle!

Sympathy between the blood and the head was suggested as a cause, but if so, why not always liquid? Sympathy on the part of the people has been vaguely hinted at. An atmosphere of belief may have some influence in obtaining a miracle, judging from the Gospels, not in working one; but in Naples the people are always sympathetic. Even antipathy had advocates, *i. e.*, the blood was the blood of St. Januarius, but the head was the head of his wicked judge, Timotheus, and the fable of a corpse bleeding when the murderer approached is recalled!

[49] "Vates," Lib. v. c. 14.

James Serces, vicar of Appleby, in Lincolnshire, remarked that the exhalations from Vesuvius and the Solfatara had something to do with it; but there are other heads and other bloods unaffected, and there are many dead in Naples and even close to Vesuvius.[50]

Animal magnetism had a trial. How vitally active might it not be from dry skull to dry blood through silver, glass and all, and a German writer had the happy thought that there were two reliquaries, one with hard and the other with liquid blood. Add a little dexterity on the part of the manipulator and the miracle was wrought. Even one of the canons told him so; if so, who would not forgive and sympathize with the poor canon?[51] A Prussian Councillor of State, Rehfues, thought a little ice (something like "sorbets," proposed an Englishman) was all that was required, which every one knows, he graciously remarks, they can prepare better at Naples than at Archangel. "Tableau (!) de Naples" is the title of his book. After dinner one day Caspar Neumann showed to some friends a head and three phials. He presented the first phial to the head, and the liquid within boiled and increased and filled the phial; the second presented only boiled; the third remained inert, and this experiment, made once in Berlin about 1734, was widely hailed as an imitation and an exposure of the great miracle at Naples.[52] This was the same learned man who, according to Hübner, claimed only a little air was required to produce the liquefaction, which the same Hübner styled the "secret of the monks."[53]

Lalande says that the Prince of San Severo had a teca made similar to that of St. Januarius, filled with an amalgam of gold and mercury, with cinnibar to color it. There was a hidden reservoir of mercury and a little opening which, when the teca was turned, permitted a little more mercury to enter; then the amalgam began to move, and so the liquefaction was imitated.[54] The government forbade the working of this miracle, we are informed, and of course, being an Italian Prince, he was probably too poor to go elsewhere and too haughty to dispose of it! La Condamine made a report to the Academie des Sciences in 1757, printed in its "Memoires" in 1762, wherein he describes a very ingenious machine containing two cones of some material unknown to him, amalgam of mercury,

---

50 "Traite sur les Miracles," 1729, Amsterdam.

51 Büsching, author of a geography.

52 "Biblioteca Germanica," lit. 29, an. 1734. In the British Museum is a leaflet entitled "Relation du Miracle de la Liquefaction du Sang a limitation du celui Qui se pratique à Naples au sang pretendu de St. Janvier," Conigsberg, 1734.

53 Hübner, "Geographie Universalle," 1757, Vol. VI., p. 495.

54 *Op. cit.*

lead and bismuth. The exhibitor promised La Condamine in Naples an exact description with a plan of all the parts. The promise was subsequently renewed, but never kept. Very probably it was the same contrivance as San Severo's. Anyhow we hear no more of it. For sake of La Condamine's own head we may mention as slight excuse that he never saw the liquefaction itself.

LATER EXPLANATIONS.

When all the various phenomena and their antiquity are borne in mind, it seems a waste of time to give the following formulas for the imitation of the Neapolitan wonder, yet they are instructive: Dissolve at moderate heat ten grains of white sago and add milk tinged with carmine; add also twelve grains of ether and place the mixture in a crystal bottle tightly corked. The mixture when cold has some consistency, but the heat of the hand or a candle suffices to melt it. This was given triumphantly by *Il Siècle* in 1858 and reprinted in many papers, including the *Times*. Dr. Punzo, by way of experiment, after many trials, made a preparation less unsatisfactory than the others, composed of alcoholic tincture of chelidonia saturated with castile soap, to which was added a slight amount of ammonia. This melted by the heat of the hand. In 1890 Professor Albini, before the Royal Academy of Physical and Mathematical Science of Naples, claimed he had a mixture of fine powdered chocolate, sugared water, cheese, whey and salt, which when allowed to remain stationary would partly solidify, and after some shakings the mass would begin to move. Sometimes it would leave no trace on the part of the glass it had passed over, and sometimes it would, and these traces when thick gave an appearance of fulness, etc. It is scarcely necessary to add that the professor, though a man of high standing as a scientist, forgot to view the liquefaction itself and to note its peculiarities. Other trials were made with gelatine, butter, etc. All these fail even to liquefy under the proper conditions. Professor Albini's mixture was not intended to be heated, simply shaken. He excluded heat as the cause. In a single bottle the heat of a candle always melted at first only the side of the mixtures; placed within a second glass they required intense heat. Glass is a bad conductor of heat. The glass of the teca is plain, has no magnifying or concentrating power; the air between the phials and their cover is still worse, so heat coming from kissing the external glass is practically nil, especially since it takes place after the liquefaction, very few doing so beforehand. What heat could a lighted candle exert, only at intervals and for a moment held behind the reliquary at a distance of three or four

inches? The other candles are not many in number and are four or five feet off. Cardinal Caracciolo once extinguished them all.

SECRET HEAT.

May there not be in the metal part of the reliquary some hidden tube or tubes by which, for instance, water and sulphuric acid or hot water or hot air might be secretly introduced? If so, they cannot be detected by any ordinary examination or even by the close scrutiny of doubters and scientists. Let us suppose they are present and chemicals can enter. The heat or the liquefaction would manifest itself at one point, the metal would show an increase of temperature; but to the touch the latter is not perceptible nor to the eye is the former. Could those chemicals enter unperceived?

It is very doubtful. If they did, how long would the heat generated last? How long would the liquefaction endure? Would not it liquefy from the surface downwards? Would it be uniform? Could any quantity be introduced without augmenting the volume of the contents, and if not, how account for the diminution also observed after liquefaction? And if the chemicals introduced cause a reduction, how account for the increase? And if it is lawful to think that chemicals can be so arranged as to produce those strange effects, how account for such wonderful knowledge of chemistry centuries and centuries ago? Are we to invent a miracle to avoid one? As the distinguished Fergola is said to have exclaimed in substance: "How marvelous the chemistry of the canons of the Treasury of Saint Januarius! The miracle is taken away from a dead saint to attribute it to living men!"

OBSERVATIONS ON THE TEMPERATURE.

The question of temperature, though, appeals so forcibly to many and the desire to know precisely what tale the thermometer tells is so reasonable that it may be useful to consider it at greater length.

Normal blood begins to coagulate in a few minutes after leaving the human body and is completely coagulated in from one to two or three hours, *i, e.*, the pale straw colored serum is separated from the netted jelly-like crassamentum formed of fibrin—a meshwork of fine fibrils and corpuscles. After some hours, from twelve to fifteen, this crassamentum or placenta sanguinis has contracted still more and becomes quite hard. Coagulation is hastened by heat, above 100 degrees F. producing it rapidly. It may be retarded by motion or even hindered altogether by the addition of alkalies, ammonia, concentrated solutions of salts and especially sulphate of

magnesia. Blood once coagulated cannot be rendered fluid, and blood chemically preserved fluid cannot coagulate. Heat applied to coagulated blood dries and hardens it more completely.[55] The blood in the phial when hard shows no separation of serum. It appears as said, dry, hard, clotted, etc. If we suppose that the serum was withdrawn by design, accident or evaporation, the liquefaction becomes still stranger. Assuming the liquefaction to be a purely natural, though unknown process, and the substance in the ampulla to be a mixture of some kind, let us see if it will even then obey the known laws of physics.[56]

Dr. Sperindeo took the temperature both of the chapel when empty of people, with all candles extinguished, and of the reliquary by inserting the tested thermometer in the crown for support and placing the bulb against the metal part of the broad ring of silver holding the two glass sides, while the substance was quite liquid and had been so for five hours, ample time to communicate some of its heat to the case if it had any extra, and he found the two temperatures alike. The first time he took it there were several persons grouped around the teca, and he found a difference of over two degrees, which he attributed to their presence, so he returned on the next day and used the above precautions. Consequently the fusion is not due apparently to heat in the reliquary, neither is it due to the difference of temperature between the chapel and the niche, because when the reliquary was reposed at night he placed a good maximum and minimum thermometer in the niche itself, and next morning 16 degrees, 8 C. was found registered. When put in the temperature was 17 degrees, 1 C., only a difference of 0 degrees, 3 C.[57] The niche, from its structure, position and freedom from currents of air, is very dry. Neither was the temperature of the chapel taken in May, 1890, notably different from the average temperature of the city, as was determined by comparing the degrees marked for a few days with those given in the Meteorological Bulletins of the Royal University of Naples. Take into account that

---

[55] At Benedict XIV.'s request, Professor Fortunio Liceto applied heat to the blood of a lamb, etc., with serum separated and not separated, and even to the blood taken from the heart of a Jesuit. This last qualification may have interfered with the success of the experiment, even though the Jesuit was dead. "De Can. Sanct.," lib. 4, c. 31, a II.

[56] The following six paragraphs are condensed entirely from Dr. Sperindeo's "Il Miracolo di San Gennaro," third edit., Naples, 1903. Those who wish to read his arguments and experiments in full are recommended to consult his pamphlets. They are apparently accurate and trustworthy. In the historical part he is perhaps not so critical or careful.

[57] Bonito, in "Gli ultimi progressi delle scienze sperimentale e la Liquefazione del Sangue di S. G.," Milan, 1881, remarks that other bodies and phials of blood have been brought up from the cold catacombs to the bright sunshine, yet no liquefaction was observed.

on 19th of September, 1879, the thermometer showing 30 degrees C. or 86 degrees F. in the chapel, over two hours passed before liquefaction set in, and on 25th of September the same year, the thermometer being 25 degrees C. or 77 degrees F., the time was thirteen minutes. Fergola published tables of observations taken in September, 1794, and we learn from them that four days the temperature was 80 degrees F., and the time from five to twenty-seven minutes, and in May, 1795, the temperature was 76 degrees on three days and the time from two to twenty-eight minutes, and twice at 77 degrees the time was twenty-nine and forty-one minutes.[58] Every known substance and every mixture fuses at a certain fixed temperature; the phial knows no such rule.

FUSION AND PRESSURE.

Every substance, as just said, melts at a certain temperature. If subjected to pressure, the melting point will be higher. Now it is well known that considerable pressure is required to raise the melting point one degree; anywhere from 28 to 500 atmospheres to raise it from one to ten degrees for such substances as paraffin, sulphur, stearine, wax, etc. It can be seen at a glance that no such pressure could be exerted in an antique crystal phial, leaving aside all the other improbabilities and impossibilities involved under the circumstances in such a hypothesis. Neither can we assume that as the phial fills the pressure changes and the time required perhaps may correspond in some measure to this change, for the irregularity in the tables shows exclusively that no such correspondence exists. In these considerations it would still be a question of heat, and that, we may safely conclude, is now ruled out of the question. Diminution of pressure can claim no consideration.

VARIABILITY OF VOLUME.

Most bodies expand when heated; some contract; others, very few, within certain limits, expand and contract, like iodide of silver, which from —10 degrees C. to +70 degrees C. contracts when heated and expands when cooled, as demonstrated by Fizeau, and every body under a certain pressure has a determined volume corresponding to its temperature. This increase or decrease, it need scarcely be said, in the case of solids and liquids is very minute; gases we need not consider here. The contents of the ampulla pay no attention to these laws. It expands, contracts or remains in-

[58] "Teorica de Miracole esposta" and "Un Discorso Apologetico sul Miracolo di S. G.," Naples, 1839. One of the deepest thinkers and distinguished scholars of Europe, in Hurter's judgment.

variable under the same atmospheric pressure and at the same temperature! Dr. Sperindeo gives a table of thirteen solids, such as graphite, carbon, sulphur, arsenic, quartz, iodide of silver, etc., and a second table of ten liquids, such as sulphuric acid, alcohol, ether, etc., and by Fizeau's formula shows their corresponding coefficients of expansion. Since the temperature at which the liquefaction and solidification of the discussed substance takes place varies as a rule from 16 degrees C. to 27 degrees C., it is not necessary to go outside this range. The expansion may occur before or after or during the liquefaction. Taking, then, quartz and wood alcohol, which show the greatest expansion, and multiplying by the coefficients of expansion for every degree from 16 degrees C. to 27 degrees C. and adding the products together, the following are the results, assuming the contents of the phial to be when half full $cm^3 30$: Quartz: $cm^3 30 \times 0.000125599 = cm^3 0.003766777$. Wood alcohol: $cm^3 30 \times 0.013900219 = cm^3 0.41700657$.

Thus, if expansion occurs before liquefaction by the effect of heat, the greatest expansion would be $cm^3 0.00376$, etc.; if after liquefaction, the greatest expansion would be $cm^3 0.417006$, etc., and this last, the greater expansion of the two, will not be surpassed if the expansion is partly before and partly after liquefaction. Taking the longer diameter of the phial to be cm^5 and the shorter as cm^3, the level of the liquid would be raised either 0.000251118 or 0.027800439; but in the phial there is an increase of nearly $30cm^3$, as it completely fills at times the empty half of the phial, the volume of which is about $60cm^3$, or two liquid ounces. Hence results an expansion at least 71 times greater than the ordinary maximum of the substances chosen for comparison within the selected degrees of temperature! No such augmentation seems to be known in physics. It cannot be claimed that the expansion of the first day is to be taken into account when seeking the expansion on the second day, and so on, because a body at a given temperature should have a definite volume, and when the temperature remains the same or rises or falls the volume should follow suit, but leaving aside this fact, the expansion of the selected substances at the end of nine days, under even this unreasonable supposition, would be for the solid, $0.003766777 \times 9 = 0.033900999$; liquid, $0.417006573 \times 9 = 3.753059339$, leaving still the increase in the phial about eight times greater. If some one demand that allowance for the increase of the daily increase be made, it would only bring the above products up to about 0.033914, etc., for the solid and 3,996858, etc., for the liquid, which would not affect the result to any appreciable extent. And these calculations are made on the supposition that the augmentation of volume is regular, whereas it is very fluctuating, as pointed

out, sometimes filling in one day and again diminishing when an increase might be expected.

THE INCREASE AND THE SCALE.

A very radical and very vulgar anti-clerical paper published in Rome, self styled the *Asino*, objected to the statement that there was any real augmentation of matter. Such a thing would be a paradox, an impossibility, and all that was required to prove this was that Dr. Sperindeo should weigh the reliquary before and after the phenomenon. A suggestion so reasonable very seldom appears in its columns. Well, Dr. Sperindeo declares he weighed the teca most carefully and repeatedly by three different methods, and got the following result:

The teca with phial almost full.....	Kg. 1.01490
The teca with phial half full.....	0.98791[59]
	0.02699

This difference of about 27 grams corresponds perfectly to an approximate diminution of volume of 23 to 24 cubic centimeters!

DIFFICULTIES OF THE GLOBO.

The *globo* presents some difficulties. It is of the same density as the rest of the matter, as is evident from the position it occupies and that when melted there is no part of the liquid denser than another. Consequently it should have the same melting point, but sometimes it has remained solid for twenty-four hours, as in May, 1902, while the remainder was perfectly liquid. It varies in size and is often found wanting. Heat producing liquefaction could not, especially after some hours, but reach the *globo*, and it is to be borne in mind that there has been observed no correspondence between the time elapsing before liquefaction or the temperature of the air or the greater or less fluidity of the substance and the size, continuance, presence or absence of the *globo*.

THE PHIAL AND THE SPECTROSCOPE.

Until comparatively lately no doubt was raised as to the contents of the ampulla being blood mixed maybe with a few grains of dust. If we take the words of Robert Gaguin literally, the phial was open in the time of Charles VIII. of France, who was handed a little rod of silver to test the hardness of the blood, and he found it "hard

[59] Page 63 of Sperindeo's work gives 0.98701 by a misprint for 0.98791, as found in Professor Januario's "Il Sangue di S. G. Nap.," 1902, p. 30.

as a stone." The Bollandists suggest that this is to be taken as merely meaning he took the teca in his hand by means of the silver stem. If we take Gaguin's version as correct, it will be rather difficult to harmonize it with the belief that the reliquary itself dates back to the time of King Robert; and yet, on the other hand, no notice is found ascribing the inclosure of the phial in the teca to any other date. We can take for granted that it was certainly so inclosed before 1659, when the Diary begins, and very probably some centuries earlier, since in the Diary and earlier accounts no mention occurs of such a work. However that may be, all old-time observers, whether they could see it better than we can or not, were unanimous as to its being genuine blood.[60] The constituents of the distant stars can be determined without analysis, why not the nature of this substance? Apply the spectroscope. The spectrum of arterial blood, or oxyhæmoglobin, is in general characterized by the presence of two absorption bands between the D and E lines of the solar spectrum. The first band commences at the D line and extends towards E. The second commences after a short gap and terminates at the E line.[61] Having mounted a drop of his own blood to get spectrum for sake of comparison to avoid error, Dr. Sperindeo, with a specially prepared spectroscope and a light whose wick had been saturated with chloride of sodium, tilted the teca until he managed to get a good spectrum of the substance, as a thin layer of it was spread over the inclined side of the phial, and thus along with Professor Januario, of the Royal University, observing both spectra, *i. e.*, of his own blood and of the phial, he found, in his own words: "Si vide allora immediaments comparire nello spectro dopo la linea D la banda oscura caratteristica del sanguine, seguita dall'altra nell verde e tra le due una zona chiara;" in other words, he had found the spectroscope of arterial blood. Professor Januario exclaimed: "I would like to photograph everything exactly!" The stains in the little phial gave the same lines. It would seem, then, reasonable to conclude that the phial of St. Januarius contains blood. If this spectrum is correct, the fact that it is the spectrum of arterial and not of venous blood renders the whole thing more wonderful, as from the color of the blood when hard and its long captivity in the ampulla it could be reasonably expected that its oxygen would be nearly if not quite vanished. Maybe its temperature when liquid is that of flowing blood.

[60] "The blood had liquefied so naturally, as to the color and consistency that no blood from a vein could appear more lively."—Lord Perth's letters, under date February 1, 1696, quoted in Murray's "Handbook for Southern Italy," ed. 1890.

[61] Landois' "Human Physiology," ed. by Starling, 1904, pp. 25, etc. Mann's "Forensic Medicine," 1902, pp. 73, 74.

BELIEF IN THE MIRACLE.

As Dumas was placed among the doubters, let him appear among the believers. He was perhaps no more sincere in one than in the other, yet his credo is openly recited, while the nego is only, perhaps, unconsciously implied in the story. Contradiction in his writings, visible or latent, caused him no worry. This quotation is from the same work containing the story:[62]

"Maintenant que le doute lève sa tête pour nier, que la science élève sa voix pour contredire: voilà ce qui est, voilà ce qui fait sans mystère, sans supercherie, sans substitution à la vue de tous. La philosophie du dix—huitième siècle et la chimie moderne y ont perdu leur latin: Voltaire et Lavoisier ont voulu mordre a cette fiole, et, comme le serpent de la fable, ils-y-ont usé leur dents—Maintenant, est-ce un secret gardé par les chanoines du Tresor et conservé de génération en génération depuis le quatrième siècle jusqu' à nous? Cela est possible; mais alors cette fidélité, on en conviendra, est plus miraculeuse éncore que le Miracle. J'aime donc mieux croire tout bonnement au Miracle, et pour ma part je déclaire que j'y crois."

Many repeat after Voltaire that the well instructed Neapolitans and Italians in general regard this miracle as Horace did the melting incense of Gnatia, only they do not permit themselves to speak so frankly as he did, their conduct and language about any subject connected with even the most popular belief being governed by the danger of being thought unbelievers and the little inconvenience they experience by appearing too credulous. We doubt if this was ever true of any large number, and certainly it is not to-day, though the danger mentioned is a thing of the past. Novelty and

---

62 This story by Dumas, mentioned in the opening paragraph, scarcely deserves or needs any further refutation. One reason why it is not true reminds us of the anecdote told of a Mayor of a little German village honored and flustered by an unexpected visit from the Emperor, upon whom he waited, trembling to explain why no cannon had been fired as a salute. "Your Imperial Majesty, there are fifty reasons. First, we have no cannon; secondly, we have no pow——" "That will do," said the Emperor, smiling. "The first is sufficient." Championnet was not in Naples in May, 1799! He visited the chapel privately in January of that year, and died several months later at Antibes . Cardinal Zurlo, then Archbishop, was friendly not hostile to the French. He signed a pastoral, "Le Citoyen Joseph Marie Card. Archevêque de Naples" (Analecta Boll., Vol. XIX., p. 49), and even caused it to be known that St. Januarius, by an unusual liquefaction, declared for the French. The same story was told of General Alvarey by M. Duclos ("Lettres sur l'Italie," 1778) as happening about fifty years earlier, and a M. N. de La Cecilia has another one fifty years later, May 6, 1848. L'Abbé Postel, who was there the same day, exposed his falsehoods. Finlly, if the story were true, it would prove nothing gainst the genuineness of the miracle.

wonder go hand in hand and frequency weakens admiration. Many of them probably never ask themselves seriously whether they believe in it as a miracle or not, but the Rev. John Chetwode Eustace, who regretted his flippancy and intended to change his words when death prevented him, wrote incorrectly, asserting that the Neapolitans had adapted the rule of the ancient Germans as given by Tacitus: "Sanctius et reverentius est de diis credere quam scire."[63] To consider the liquefaction as a trick would be impossible except to a few noted for their atheistic or irreligious views. As many Londoners have never visited the Tower, so some Neapolitans may have never seen the miracle. The opportunity being at hand, they procrastinate like other mortals. As a people they do believe and are attached to it, though both belief and attachment may appear somnolent or non-existent until something arises to disturb their calm indifference. Many an object until threatened evokes little display of the deep feelings it can arouse. Towards the middle of the eighteenth century Bishop Sabbatinus wrote that some Catholics who had never seen it doubted it, but once seen doubt vanished. It is much the same to-day. Some outside Italy have never heard, or have forgotten, or give themselves no concern about it. If they were suddenly asked their opinion they would be puzzled to reply. The liquefaction, like other miracles recorded of the saints, is for them a question of proof. Its long continuance and the attitude of the Church in Italy while inclining the will to believe, could not of itself be sufficient to move the intellect to assent. The Church has given no decision, and no circumstances seem likely to arise to urge her to do so. Some doubt, but once examined the great majority would believe, and not one in ten thousand after seeing it would hesitate to accept it as supernatural, and that one at most would be worried with the thought that perhaps after all it might be explained on purely natural grounds. Horace was referred to on account of the lines in the fifth satire of the first book descriptive of his journey to Brundisium:

> Dehine Gnatia, lymphis
> Iratis exstructa dedit risusque, jocosque
> Dum flamma sine thura liquescere limine sacro
> Persuadere cupit.

It is said that the raillery of Horace extinguished for good the fireless smoking incense. Did Voltaire hope by his satiric grin to congeal forever the blood of St. Januarius? The next paragraph may answer.

PROPHECIES.

Prophecies are not rated very high at present, but to render the

[63] Author of the charming "Tour Through Italy," London, 1813, p. 492.

account less incomplete, a few words about foretelling by the blood and about the blood. Is it a prophetic blood? The writer paid but little attention to this question, and merely wishes to record the present popular opinion, which is that when the blood is found liquid it is generally regarded as a bad sign. If found hard, and it remains so, the omen for evil is emphatic. Girolamo M. di Sta. Anna, in his life of the saint (1733), says the finding it liquid is a sign of some danger happily averted, and Tutini considered it a sign of future grace. Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II.) mentions in 1456 its prophetic aspect, and Robert Gaguin adds that the liquefaction was supposed to indicate a new ruler's right, and *vice versa*. Hence the stories told about the supposed compulsory liquefaction. There has been observed some correspondence between the failure of the miracle and hurtful events, but whether they were more than coincidences is an open question.

How few men can resist the inclination or inspiration to prophesy! Even the High Priest of pseudo-rationalism fell a victim and burst forth A. D. 1764 in quite a solemn strain: "Archbishops of Naples! the time shall come when the blood of Mr. St. Januarius will not liquefy when it approaches his head. It shall be when the Neapolitans know enough to know that this sleight of hand is not worth a ducat to them and is absolutely useless to the prosperity of the citizens." The note of utility is heard again. And how long a time must elapse before the nobles and citizens attain this giddy height of knowledge, O prophet? With a vagueness surpassing Biblical prophetical vagueness, so exasperating to some critics, comes the reply: "Some centuries" (dans quelques siècles). Knowledge surely lingers. Twenty-five years after M. Dupaty, another "romancier voyageur," being a man of desires, wrote that for some time the miracle had fallen into disrepute and it was likely to cease soon. A century has passed since the disciple wrote, and with the advance of knowledge the mystery of Naples deepens, and a later science than Lavoisier's only reveals depths still greater and difficulties more numerous than superficial inquiry had discovered and discussed.

CONCLUSION.

A miracle? The writer fosters no hope that *à priori* disbelievers or theorists who hold miracles ceased at the close of the apostolic age or of the first few Christian centuries will believe the liquefaction to be miraculous. Neither will he discuss the questions very likely to arise as to this miracle's utility, probability or consistency with Divine Wisdom. Admit one miracle since creation, and logically all others can enter in if fortified with sufficient proof. A

miracle because of its supernatural origin is regarded with suspicion or as a natural fact misunderstood or unexplained. Sciences like astronomy and chemistry know facts which run contrary to accepted theories, but though troublesome they are tolerated and progress is made. A miracle comes clothed in such circumstances as to show plainly it is an ex lex, and as such it could be confined in a special category; but this consideration soothes not the nerves of those who affect to dread, like Professor Huxley, that if its possibility were granted a miracle might force its unbidden and unheralded way like a bold poor relation into the halls of science or, to change the expression, it might spring up unexpectedly out of the crucible like a jack-in-the-box. No. The laws of nature must be maintained inviolate despite Omnipotence and the will of the Lawgiver; so the reader, if he will, may finish the quotation from Horace:

Credat Judaeus Apella,
Non ego.

And if, though a believer in miracles, you hesitate at this one, you can fall back upon the fact the matter has not been analyzed; other substances give almost identical spectrums with oxyhæmoglobin; the dust of the Solfatara mixed with the blood may produce strange results, etc. In a word, you can summon up many doubts from the vast sea of possibility by calling on unknown forces, unknown rays, unknown substances; but it is not asking too much of a careful reader to think that Professor Punzo may have been right when, after his examinations, he concluded: "Since the liquefaction and all the other phases presented by the stubstance in question can be explained by no means known to us, we must conclude that in the present state of science we cannot solve this mysterious problem."

If some one be so extremely credulous (a mild word here) as to think it a trick or fraud, to believe that the venerable Archbishop of Naples and the grave and reverend canons and chaplains dare, through simplicity, in the twentieth century, in broad daylight, to have solemn processions and to invite the whole world, as we may say, to be present at the melting by a little heat of a little gelatine, or sago, or some "mixture fusing at a low temperature,"[64] and then dare, through wickedness, to sing hymns of praise to God, or rather

[64] Few men have apparently consulted so many books as Andrew D. White, LL. D., L. H. D. It is to be hoped that the following extract is not a fair sample of his historical research and critical ability. The ex-president of Cornell University saw the miracle in 1856, and yet he wrote: "To the scientific mind this miracle is very simple. The vials contain, *no doubt*, one of those mixtures fusing at low temperature, which when kept in its place within the cold stone walls of the church remain solid, but upon being brought out into the hot, crowded chapel, and *fondled* by the warm hands of the priests, gradually softens and becomes liquid" (italics not in the original).—"New Chapters in the Warfare of Science," XII., Part I.

of insult, for He has no need of lies; if some one prefer to believe all this and the added miracle, no slight one, that for centuries and centuries the formula of the compound must have been kept a profound secret, all the writer would ask in this hypothesis, a hypothesis little flattering either to the head or to the heart of those in whose favor it is made, is that the trick of the liquefaction be not characterized as "bungling" or "miserable," since it has defied discovery and imitation for a thousand years, and is likely—forgive the lapse into prophecy—to continue to do so yet a little while.

If analyzed to-morrow, and thus found to be blood, would any one believe on that account? Not one. Let us suppose that the cause of such a peculiar liquefaction, at variance with all known laws of physics and chemistry, with its strange increases of volume and weight, would some day be explained by science, would even then any doubt be cast by reasonable men on the veracity and honesty of any concerned in the preservation and exhibition of the phial of St. Januarius?

E. P. Graham.

Lapeer, Mich.

THE HELIAND.

GERMAN poetry and song are as old as the German people. When history first becomes acquainted with the blond-haired and blue-eyed warriors of the German forests she also learns of their soul-stirring songs. When the Germans,[1] Tacitus tells us, march to battle they sing the praises of their ancient heroes. Armenius was one of these bold warriors celebrated by his countrymen in the second century—Armenius, who had crushed the legions of Varus and the spirit of the aged Augustus. Raising their deep voices in far resounding chorus, they roused themselves and one another to fight the hereditary enemy, to emulate their hero's prowess. The earliest songs of the Germans, then, like the earliest songs of the Greeks, were choruses. Soon, however, the hearers craved to learn not only the names of the bold champions, but their deeds also. But to sing of their achievements, to describe their daring exploits, was beyond the power of the chorus. Only the single singer could be followed as he passed from phase to phase of the exciting tale. Thus arose the ballad singer and the epic bard. The German tribes when they left their wild forests to conquer the Roman world were accom-

[1] Tacitus, Germania, ch. III.

panied by these heralds of bravery and heroism. When at length the invasion was successful and the Theodorics and Chlodovics founded kingdoms and rested from their warlike labors, amid the remnants of Roman luxury and splendor, the German minstrel—*scôp* is his Anglo-Saxon name—was the never-failing guest of the royal table. There, when the material feast had ended, he raised his voice to sing the wonderful exploits of his host and his host's forefathers. Even at the court of that scourge of God, Attila the Hun, many of whose paladins were Germans, Priscus, the Byzantine Emperor's envoy, listened to German bards singing their ballads. At each stirring passage the young warriors ominously rattled their swords, while the gray-beards, conscious that age henceforth debarred them from the excitement and the wild joys of battle, silently wept, so did the minstrel move the hearts of these men. Most moving of all these minstrels, perhaps, was luckless Gelimer, the last King of the Vandals in Africa. When reduced to the last extremity he begged his conqueror for a lyre, and to its strains sang the sad tale of his woes and disasters.

It was at the court of the Ostrogoths that these minstrels reached the height of art and fame. Even before the great Theodoric (Dietrich) smote the Herulan Odovaker (A. D. 488) and fixed his court at Verona,[2] Gothic singers had embalmed the story of their nation in verse. The influence of Roman taste and culture was not lost on this gifted people, and again the conquered vanquished their conquerors. Soon the fame of the Gothic minstrels reached the farthermost limits of Germany, and their ballads resounded at the court of the Frank and the Burgundian. Wherever the German hordes had settled, wherever the German tongue was spoken, the names of the Gothic heroes became household words. Hildebrand and Dietrich, of Bern, were as well known on the Rhine as on the Po and the Tiber. In the course of time their names became interwoven with those of the great northern heroes, Siegfried and Hagen, in utter defiance of history, chronology and geography. The Franks themselves had no national epic till 500 A. D. But soon inspired and taught by their Gothic brethren, the Frankish bards chanted the achievements of Siegfried, their national champion. In the course of the sixth century Norse skalds repeated their lays in the far North.

How many of these epics were then composed, how popular they became and what were their poetic merits we cannot now ascertain. Only a few remnants have escaped the ravages of time. The Anglo-Saxon song of Beowulf may be classed as one of these. The Anglo-Saxon language was a dialect of the Germanic language.

[2] Bern in the German epics.

The Latin ballad of Walther of Aquitaine, written by Ekkehard, monk of St. Gall, as a youthful exercise in Latin verse, and pronounced by Sherer a poem full of manly vigor and poetic inspiration, presupposes a German ballad from which Ekkehard drew his story.[3] But the only strictly German relic of this supposed harvest of song is the lay of Hildebrand. Even this is a mere fragment. On account of its being the earliest specimen of German narrative poetry, as well as on account of its own merits, it deserves to be briefly sketched.

Hildebrand, foremost among Dietrich's warriors, has shared his master's exile and lived for years at the court of Etzel (Attila), the Hun. At last the day of liberation arrives. At the head of an army of his Goths, aided by the Huns, Dietrich crosses the Alps to reconquer his kingdom. Chief among his warriors is Hildebrand. Hildebrand when driven from Italy had left behind him a youthful wife and infant son—Hadubrand. When Dietrich reaches Italy he is met by a hostile army. Hadubrand is one of its chiefs. "I have heard," the minstrel begins, abruptly, "that Hildebrand and Hadubrand challenged each other to battle." When father and son, armed and mounted, meet face to face, Hadubrand, in answer to his father's inquiry, proudly proclaims himself Hildebrand's son. A second question, and a more detailed answer leaves no doubt in the father's mind. His challenger is his own son. He is deeply stricken by the tragic situation. He tells Hadubrand his name. In vain. Hildebrand, the young hero tells him, has died the warrior's death. The father offers his son his bracelets, the proudest ornament of the Teuton warrior. Hadubrand scornfully rejects the offered presents. He almost begs his son to seek some other foe. Then Hadubrand taunts him with cowardice, and the aged hero knows that he has no choice. Cruel fate has decreed that he must either slay his own son or fall by the hand of the obstinate man. In pathetic but manly words he gives utterance to the bitter struggle that rends his soul. Then the combat begins. Bravely each hero meets his opponent. They hurl their spears, which glance from their shields. Instantly they leap from their steeds, draw their falchions and hack each other's wooden-rimmed shields. Here ends the fragment preserved for us on the covers of a theological tract by two monks of Fulda. But we know the result of the duel from other sources. The son falls by the father's sword, and Hildebrand's lament concluded the tragic song. It seems almost an echo of the Greek legends that tell in heart-moving words of the pitiless rule of Fate, the legends of Œdipus and Orestes.

[3] The Latin poem was written about 900 A. D. A spirited German version may be found in Von Scheffel's Ekkehard.

The Lay of Hildebrand, then, is the only remnant of the early pre-Christian German epic.

It is truly to be regretted that so little of this early poetry remains. These early pagan minstrels were not destined long to bask in the sunshine of royalty. One after another the German tribes, and especially their chiefs, listened to Christ's teaching and forswore the worship of Donar and Wodan. As early as 500 A. D. Clovis, the Frankish conqueror, embraced the faith, and soon other chiefs followed. St. Columbanus, an Irish missionary, became the apostle of the Alemanni (600-700 A. D.), and about the same time St. Gall, another Irish monk, founded the monastery of St. Gall in Switzerland, for centuries the foster mother of learning and virtue. In the eighth century St. Boniface carried the light of the Gospel to Holland and Central Germany, and not long after Charlemagne, some times a rude missionary, it must be admitted, brought the Saxons and their bold Duke Widukind under the yoke of Christ. The spread of the faith did not prove propitious to the old German minstrel. Many of his songs celebrated the power and achievements of Wodan and the other divinities that dwelt in Asgard, the German Olympus. Even his praises of the national heroes were saturated with too much pagan lore. To Christian missionaries and converted chiefs such lays, attractive on account of their form, popular as the inheritance of their fathers, might well seem dangerous obstacles to the spread and final victory of Christianity.

In this way the introduction of Christianity was fatal to the old German court minstrels. But we must not infer that the rulers and Bishops of Christianized Germany were hostile to culture and enlightenment. No man in the history of civilization is in fairness less open to this charge than the great Charles, the Frankish conqueror of the Saxons. No monarch has done more for the intellectual and spiritual welfare of his subjects. No sovereign has been a more ardent admirer of learning, of literature and of art. We shall not here speak of all he did for the education of his court, his nobles and the clergy. We shall speak of him only as a furtherer of old German literature. Zealous promoter and protector of Christianity, he ordered his scholars to make a collection of the old national poems, objectionable though they were from the Christian standpoint. Unfortunately his scholarly care was in vain. These venerable monuments of the earliest German literature have perished, leaving hardly a trace behind them. But Charlemagne's activity in another direction was destined to bear richer fruit. By his order the Creed, the Our Father and the Gospel according to St. Matthew were translated into German for the use of the people. This is the earliest German prose of which history has preserved

ention. To us this primitive collection may seem of little worth om a literary point of view. But, when we recall the multitude grand and sublime thoughts thus made familiar to the rude ildren of the primeval German forests, we, the best elements of hose civilization are after all built upon these same fundamental ocuments, should be the last to belittle the wisdom and the great- ss of this achievement.

Soon the poetic spirit of the German people found in the new ith new material for its creative activity. Among the oldest ecimens of extant German poetry are the "Wesso bounner Gebet" d the "Muspilli." The former furnishes us with a poetic account the creation, while the theme of the latter poem is the "Last dgment." Thus the muse passed into the service of the Christian ligion. Most of the religious poems written in the period between o and 900 A. D. have left no traces. All the more important and teresting is the old Saxon poem called by its first publisher (1830 . D.) "The Heliand" (or the Saviour), the oldest extant competent oetic monument of the German language.

"The Heliand" has been pronounced by Vilmar, a noted historian German literature, "the best, most perfect and most sublime eation of Christian poetry" and "one of the grandest poems pro- uced by the poetic inspiration of man." Surely this is no ordinary raise, and the poem that has called forth such enthusiasm in a ineteenth century scholar is well deserving our study. Before troducing our readers to "The Heliand" itself, let us glance at s history, for, as the old grammarian says: "Books, too, have eir fortunes." No mediæval chronicler speaks of the old Saxon ard and his Christiad. In 1562 Matthius Flacius Illyricus, in a amphlet containing a bitter attack on Catholicism, published a atin fragment entitled "Praefatio and Versus," which informs us at the Emperor Louis the Pious, son of the Great Charles, design- g to spread among the Saxons the knowledge of the Christian ligion, had engaged a well-known Saxon bard to tell in Saxon erse the story of the Old and New Testaments. The "Praefatio" as often republished by subsequent scholars, but as yet no trace the poem had been found. Not till 1705 did any part of the xt of "The Heliand" appear, and then only a small fragment was rinted by George Hickes, an English scholar, in his "Linguarum eterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus," Oxford, 1705. Hickes und the treasure in a manuscript still preserved in the Cottonian llection of the British Museum, which Sir Robert Cotton (+1631) ad owned and, as a note in his own handwriting informs us, had nsidered to be a Danish poem. Hickes himself at first judged e language to be Anglo-Saxon, but afterwards declared that it

was Frankish and that the text contained a poem. In 1720 Johann Georg Eckhart, who had become acquainted with our epic, ventured the opinion that the "Praefatio" published by Flacius referred to the poem found in Sir Robert Cotton's library. It is interesting to know that Klopstock, the famous author of the "Messiade," took an interest in the Messiade of the old Saxon bard. After Klopstock various German scholars studied and copied a second manuscript found at Bamberg and now in the Munich library. Among these were Schiller's brother-in-law, Reinwald, who made a copy of the Munich codex and composed a grammar of its language, which, however, were not published. He also recognized the work as a poem, while Docen found that it was written in alliterative verse. Reinwald also adopted Eckhart's view that the poem was the same as the one spoken of in the "Praefatio" published by Mathias Flacius. Reinwald's studies fell into the hands of J. A. Schmeller, who made them the basis of the first complete edition of the work, which appeared in 1830. Schmeller was also the author of the name "The Heliand." Schmeller's edition led to a closer study of the work by Germanistic scholars and was the forerunner of editions by Köne, Heyne, Rückert, Sievers and Behaghel and of translations by Simrock, Kannegiesser, Köne, Rapp, Grein and Herrmann. These editors and translators include some of the most distinguished names in Germanic philology and are a guarantee that the work has not only been thoroughly studied, but also that it was worthy of patient investigations.

For years the question whether "The Heliand" is or is not the work spoken of in the "Praefatio" has been discussed pro and con. The "Praefatio" has been most minutely scrutinized and analyzed, and it is now unanimously held that the title is a misnomer due to Flacius, and that it is really a letter written probably not very long after the composition of the poem, that is to say, in the ninth century. The most telling argument against identifying "The Heliand" with the Saxon lay spoken of in the "Praefatio" was the fact that while the latter speaks of a poem including both Old and New Testaments, "The Heliand" contains no part of the Old Testament story. This difficulty, however, was removed in 1894, when Zangemeister and Braune published some fragments of a Saxon metrical version of Genesis found in the "Bibliotheca Palatina" at Heidelberg. Therefore there really existed, as stated in the "Praefatio," an old Saxon metrical version of the Old Testament. At present most scholars endorse the genuineness of the "Praefatio" and the identity of "The Heliand" with the old Saxon poem there mentioned.

"The Heliand" literature deals with two other questions—the

author and his home. No clue whatsoever exists as to the author's name, which is not even mentioned in the "Praefatio." That "The Heliand" was written in old Saxon is now generally conceded; but in what part of the Saxon land it was written is by no means settled. The difficulty of deciding it is increased by the circumstance that the two principal manuscripts of "The Heliand"—the Cottonian and the Munich—exhibit marked dialectic variations, and naturally suggest different places of origin according as the critic prefers the one or the other. It is needless to persue the subject further. We confine ourselves to the remark that Münster and Werden are the places chiefly favored by authoritative German critics, though it cannot be said that there is any approach to unanimity on the question.

On the poetic merits of our epic there is some variety of opinion. While Vilmar, in his "History of German Literature," declares enthusiastically that no epic in any language singing the story of Our Saviour is at all to be compared with "The Heliand," Scherer denies to it almost all poetic merit and looks upon it as a kind of metrical tract. Between these extremes we meet with many intermediate opinions. Among these we may quote: Simrock, who declares that what Klopstock failed to accomplish the author of "The Heliand" achieved, namely, a truly poetic Christiad; Köne, who judges "The Heliand" to be a creation worthy to be admired and to be revered; Rapp, according to whom our bard is not only a noble Christian and patriot, but a great poet; Windisch, who calls our poem a perfect epic according to the rules of art; Grein, who describes to it a charm which impresses us the more, the more we study the poem; Schultz, who finds in it an artistic perfection only to be expected in the work of a highly gifted poet; Rückert, who pronounces the author of "The Heliand" a poet of the first rank; Koegel, whose judgment is to the effect that the old Saxon *scôp* is a true artist of by no means small abilities, whilst in another passage he maintains that though perhaps the poem has been by some praised too highly, the poet has done the possible, and to expect him to turn the New Testament into an epic full of life and action is to expect the impossible; Bechstein, who calls it a remarkable and original creation; Braune, in whose opinion the work ought to be rated higher poetically than has become fashionable recently. Braune's and Koegel's views are repeated by Paul.

We could multiply quotations of a similar character, but this would only weary the reader. Nor is it worth while to set down the unfavorable opinions of Scherer and Behaghel, when we find the best German scholars, both philologists and historians, unanimous in heralding its excellence. To us the judgment of Koegel

seems to hit the mark. The author of "The Heliand" has chosen for his subject a difficult theme, but he has achieved all that can be looked for. Let us for a moment ponder the task he set himself. A long epic, for its complete success, demands connected and interesting action, possessing strict unity, with a hero impressive and sympathetic, surrounded by striking minor characters who, while providing variety of interest, are a foil to the principal hero. Now the story of the New Testament, while it offers the poet the most sublime of all heroes, has two weak features from the point of view of the epic writers—it is lacking in action and furnishes almost no secondary characters. For alongside of Christ all the other actors, both His followers and His enemies, are dwarfed. Even the Blessed Virgin, great as is the poet's devotion to her and manifest as are his efforts to throw strong lights on her, is a passive character. How he has painted St. Peter the reader will have occasion to judge while perusing the excerpts to be quoted. Herod, Pilate, Annas, Caiphas are not attractive characters to deal with, and besides their share in the action is, so to say, episodical. The lack of action in the Biblical narrative has already been suggested, and this is brought into relief by the long didactic passages recording Our Lord's teaching. Christ's miracles on the one hand add striking incidents to the progress of the story; on the other, many of them look like repetitions, yield no variety and beget monotony. Some of them were unintelligible to the poet's readers, such as the healing of the lepers and of the possessed. The author of "The Heliand" did not fail to perceive these obstacles to a poetic treatment of the Gospel narrative, and he strove earnestly to overcome them. He did not base his poem on the four Gospels directly. He probably built it upon the Diatesseron or "Gospel Harmony" of Tatian, or perhaps that of Ammonius' works, combining the narratives of the four Evangelists so as to give a chronologically consecutive history of the Redeemer's life and actions. Of the 184 chapters in Tatian's book he cast out sixty entirely and forty in part. We see our poet knew the value of condensation. The parts omitted are chiefly the records of miracles, but also quite a number of speeches. His aim is to prevent the dragging of the action, and so far as it is possible to do so he has succeeded. But as literary critics purely, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that even in this condensed form the poem often drags from lack of action and excess of speech-making.

He did not confine himself to Tatian's work, however. Modern scholarship has not only proved conclusively that he used other works, but has shown who some of his authorities were. It has established the fact that the worthy minstrel who sang Christ's

praises so loyally and effectively was a man well versed in the theology of his time. The writings of Rhabanus Maurus, the great Abbot of Fulda, one of the most learned men of his day, and the works of the Venerable Bede were especially laid under contribution. He used them not only as guides in matters of doctrine, but also borrowed from their commentaries details not found in the Gospels. In the narrative of the visit of the wise men to the Infant Saviour, for instance, he tells us how in days long past the Prophet Balaam foretold the coming of the Redeemer and the appearance of His wonderful Star.

With these preliminary remarks, we venture to present some details to our readers.

Like the Song of Beowulf, "The Heliand" is written in the old national verse, an alliterative line consisting of two members, each having three or four arses or accented syllables. In this respect "The Heliand" is a true representative of the oldest German poetry. Other features also prove that the poet was well read in the ancient epics of his country. For, as in Homer certain words and phrases are repeated again and again, repetitions which contribute greatly to give to the Greek poems their peculiar coloring, so in "The Heliand" we find similar epic formulas, some of them showing by their mythological character that they were fixed poetic adornments even in pagan times. The dress of our lay is, therefore, thoroughly national.

The style of "The Heliand" is simplicity itself. In vain do we look for the striking metaphors and similes that lend such charm to Homer's immortal verse. To the old German was not given the keen feeling for literary beauty that distinguished the ancient Greek even at the very dawn of Greek poetry. In connecting together the successive incidents of a story the writer exhibits the same artlessness. Frequently the adverb *then* is used to make the connection. Like the authors of the Hildebrandslied and the Beowulf, our poet also is fond of dwelling on a thought by repetition, only he carries this expedient for producing an impression to much greater lengths. Indeed, this trick, bearable in the expression of strong and continued passion by the lyric poet, but rarely happy in poetic narrative, at times leads the singer of "The Heliand" into verbosity and bathos. With this peculiarity may be classed the accumulation of laudatory appositives, especially in speaking of Christ and the Blessed Virgin. Another characteristic of our writer's style is his inclination to substitute a pronoun for the subject of a sentence, introducing the principal word afterwards as an appositive. The aim of this arrangement was to emphasize the word thus postponed. In English it has often a contrary effect.

In a modern translation some of these peculiarities must be sacrificed, and the reader must bear in mind that to an old Saxon what for us is an element of offense was a source of strength and beauty. That our poem, therefore, in many features of its style and composition suffers from a lack of this highest art must be admitted. In spite of this, however, its very simplicity is attractive and impressive—and how attractive and impressive simplicity can be is known to every reader of Homer and the Bible. The dignity of the narrative, partly the outcome of the original story, no doubt, impresses us throughout, and not unfrequently the author rises to true grandeur and sublimity. Who can fail to be impressed by the vigor of the description of the signs preceding the Last Judgment?

Then to Him came in secret His retainers.
"My Lord, how long," asked they, "shall this world last
And flourish, ere its hour of doom will come,
And ere the last day's sun illuminate
The heaven? When dost Thou contemplate again
To come upon this earth and judge mankind,
The quick and dead, good Lord? To know when this
Shall happen we are anxious, Christ all-ruling."
Then kindly answer to His men gave Christ,
The All-Ruler. "That," quoth He, "has our good Lord
Concealed, the Heavenly Father, so completely
Hidden, the Ruler of the world, that none
Of all the sons of men may know the time
When for this earth shall come this awful day.
God's angels even, they that ever stand
Before the Almighty face, even they know not
The day; nor can they tell when fate decrees
That He this world will visit, He the great
Liege-lord of men. My Heavenly Father knows it
Alone; from others all, both quick and dead,
It is withheld when He will come to judgment.
But I may tell you what portentous signs
Will first appear before He come from heaven
That solemn day. Then will it come to pass
That moon and stars will lose their sheen, and both
Be wrapt in darkness weird. The stars will fall,
The blazing orbs of heaven; the earth will tremble,
And quake this world so broad. Yea, many wonders,
Even such as these, will come to pass. The mighty
Waters will rage, and ocean with its billows
Will smite with fear and awe earth-dwelling men.
The nations then, aghast in throes of terror,
Will wither all, o'erwhelmed with gruesome horror,
The people perish. Peace will then be nowhere,
But everywhere upon the earth will strife
Arise most bitter; race will rise 'gainst race,
Kings quarrel, armies march, and death strike down
Men without number; universal war
Will reign: indeed, it is a horrid thought
That men such gory murder will stir up.
Moreover, plagues will harrow every land,
And men will die in throngs more numerous
Than happened e'er before; assailed by illness,
Some will, as struck by lightning, fall and die,
Ending their days and losing eke their life.
Consuming hunger grim pursues the sons of men,
The worst of famines. Not the least of tortures,
Which on the day of doom will strike the earth,
Will be this cruel famine. When you'll see
These horrors you may know in sooth that near
To mankind is the last of days, the day
Of terror; when in power untold will come
With all the multitude of heavenly hosts
The Lord in all His glory. Mark! these trees

Are a true image of those dread events.
For when they sprout and bloom and put forth leaves,
Display their foliage, then the sons of men
Know that ere long the summer days will come,
Gladsome and sunny, days full bright and fair;
So, also, by the signs I have foretold
You'll know when comes to men the last of days.
In truth, say I to you, before this people,
This generation pass away my words
Will be fulfilled."

—Heliand II., 4286-4349.

The poetic vocabulary, the metre and the style of "The Heliand," as we have said, was truly national. But how could the poet treat the subject in such a way as to make Christ's person and mission intelligible to his newly converted countrymen? Here a formidable problem faced our author. To a Saxon of the ninth century, lord or retainer, the activity of Our Saviour as the greatest of prophets and teachers was plainly a mystery. Of philosophic lore they had no idea, and their religious conceptions hardly extended beyond belief in their traditional gods and the observance of the sacrifices and ceremonies prescribed by ancestral usage. What they honored was nobility, wisdom in council, bravery, the devotion of the follower to his chief and conversely the unswerving loyalty of the chief to his men. Now, while the divine heroism of Jesus far surpasses the heroism of all, even of the boldest warriors, it is yet of a very different type, and the Apostles and disciples of Holy Scripture are characters far removed from the faithful, daring, ruthless German warriors, who rejoiced in the battle as in a wedding feast. But there was no help for it. If the poet wished to speak to the hearts of his countrymen, if he wished to reach their sympathies and arouse in them a fiery enthusiasm for the Lord Christ, he must portray Jesus to them from a point of view that was not beyond their intelligence, their sympathies and their traditional ideas. This, accordingly, is what he has done, and the solution of this problem without materially distorting the Christian conception of the Redeemer and the redemption, is assuredly no mean literary achievement. Throughout the poem the singer, mindful that Christ as God was the All-ruling King of the universe, and as man the scion of David's royal race, represents Him as the great Liege-lord to whom all men owe fealty. He is "the strongest and most powerful of Kings," "the folk-King," "the Shepherd of the land." His Apostles and disciples are His liegemen, faithful and true, ready to do Him service, but expecting in return material evidence of His generosity. Fishermen though they are, they are all "nobly born" and "men of wisdom." St. Matthew, the Roman tithe gatherer, appears as a liegeman of the Cæsar of Rome, who leaves his master's service and becomes Christ's follower, because Christ is a greater Lord and will reward him more liberally.

The Scripture narrative, it is true, offers but few occasions to paint the Apostles as valiant warriors fighting for their Chief; but these occasions our poet seizes with ardor. Here is the story of Peter drawing his sword and smiting Malchus:

> But up the hillside ran some daring men,
> Bold they of heart, determined in their souls;
> Against Him rushed they, filled with spite and hate,
> Until the throng hemmed in the Saviour Christ.
> Downcast and gloomy stood Christ's followers,
> Though men of wisdom, when they saw these deeds
> Of wickedness, and to their Lord they spake.
> "Were it Thy bidding now, Almighty Lord,"
> Quoth they, "that by the falchion's edge or point
> Of spear we die, certes nothing were so sweet
> As for our Liege-lord here to fall, death-pale
> With gory wounds." Then wrath-inflamed and quick
> The warrior Simon Peter seethed and boiled,
> So that he could not say a single word.
> Full wroth in heart was he that men his Lord
> Should dare to fetter. Mad with pain and gloom,
> He ran to stand before his King, hard by
> His Lord. Far famed his valor, daring was
> His heart, but forth he drew his weapon, drew
> The falchion at his side, and leaped against
> The foremost of the foes with might and main;
> And with the sharp edge of his blade smote Malchus
> Upon his right side, marked him with his sword.
> His ear was severed, wounded was his head,
> That from the blow both ear and cheek ran gory;
> And from the gash the blood leaped forth in streams,
> Welling from out his wounds. Then smitten sore
> Was Malchus, the foremost of His foes.
> Fast scattered then the throng; they feared his steel.
> Then spoke the Son of God to Simon Peter,
> And bade him place within its sheath his blade.
>
> —Heliand II., 4856-4886.

In the same way, when some of our Lord's kinsmen will not hear of His going up to Jerusalem, the poet with manifest warmth dwells on St. Thomas' proposal that the Apostles accompany their Lord and shed their blood for Him. In this way we see he succeeds fairly well in shaping the characters of the Gospel to fit the ideals of the warlike Saxon. But there are incidents in the sacred narrative which defied all his skill. To make Christ, the greatest of Liege-lords and mightiest of Kings, enter Jerusalem on Palm Sunday riding on an ass, was not to be tolerated. It would have jarred every Saxon prejudice. Still the author had too much respect for the sacred narrative where it relates to Our Saviour Himself to change it. So he omits not only the ass, but the entire scene. In the same way he passes over in silence Christ's healing of lepers, a sickness unknown to the Saxons. Christ's injunction to offer the left cheek to the smiter of the right was *caviare* to the Saxon general and is prudently cut out. On the other hand, where the sacred story enables him to bring out scenes and occupations familiar to his people, the author of "The Heliand" eagerly seizes them. The Saxons dwelt on the shores of the German Ocean. They were bold, enthuiastic mariners, at home on the blue waters

of the ocean, fearless amid the buffetings of the storm and the billows. Mark how the poet paints the storm on Lake Genesareth:

Hither had come from every land and nation
A mighty throng to honor Christ and offer
Homage to this great Lord, the Son of God.
The All-Ruler, with His followers, withdrew
To sail upon a lake in Galilee,
A flowing sea. The rest of His companions
He bade proceed, while He with some few men
Embarked upon a ship—the Saviour Christ—
To rest, for He was weary from the way.
Up hoisted then their sails the weatherwise
Among His men; the favoring wind impelled
Their pinnace o'er the water, till He came
Unto the middle of the lake, the All-Ruler,
With His retainers. Then began the wind
To rage; up rose a tempest, billows swelled.
The heavens were wrapt in gloom, the sea commenced
To roll, the waters wrestled with the winds;
Fright smote the men. The lake grew wild and wilder;
The sailors all despaired of life. Then roused
They with their words the Guardian of the world;
Told Him the fierceness of the storm, and asked
That Christ the Saviour save them from the waves,
"Or[4] we shall perish here upon this sea,
Mid awful horrors."

—Heliand II., 2231-2250.

We cannot fail to recognize the truth and vigor of the picture here presented, and feel that only a man at home on the sea and familiar with its wild whims could have painted it. We note especially the striking image of the winds wrestling with the waves. But the whole passage is full of life and strength.

The passion of these primitive sons of the German forests for war and its wild scenes we have already dwelt upon. Another national characteristic was their fondness for feasts and banquets. When they could not give vent to their mad spirits on the battlefield or in the chase, they gave themselves up to the pleasures of the cup and the table, amid the display of a barbaric magnificence. Whenever, therefore, the sacred narrative affords an opportunity to our author to gratify the national taste in this particular he is not slow to seize it. Though the Scripture story be simple and unpretending, he becomes eloquent and enlarges the picture. Take his account of the marriage of Cana, for instance:

Three days thereafter into Galilee
Went forth the Liege-lord of this multitude.
There was He bidden to a feast, the Son
Of God. There was the wedding of a bride,
A winsome maid. There Mary, too, had come,
Together with her Son—the blessed Maiden.
The Mother of the Sovereign Lord of all
Went to this place with His retainers—God's
Own Son—into the lofty mansion, where the throng
The Jews were feasting in the spacious hall.
He, too, sat at the banquet and made known
That He had power divine, strength from the Father
And from the Holy Spirit, the All-Ruler's
Wisdom. Inside the crowd was gay; reveled

[4] The change from indirect to direct discourse and *vice versa* is quite common in the Heliand.

The guests full merry, frolicksome the men.
In came the attendants; butlers came with cups,
Fetched in the sparkling wine in goblets huge
And mighty tankards. Through the hall there bustled
A lively throng of guests fair to be seen.
Now on their benches men were filled with mirth,
And jolly were they all. Just then the wine
Gave out; no more of joy-inspiring drink
Then had the hosts, for nowhere in the house
Was found a single cup which to the throng
The butlers might bring in: the jars were void.
Ere long Christ's Mother, fairest of all women,
Remarked their wants and sought out her dear Child,
Even her own Son, and told Him that the hosts
Had no more wine to offer to the guests.
Then earnestly she begged the holy Christ
Their needs to help and give them kindly aid.
—Heliand II., 1994-2023.

The early lines of this passage afford some striking examples of the poet's stylistic peculiarities, the cumulation of appositives, the postponement of the subject and the repetition of the same thought to lay stress on it. We observe, too, that the bridal house, simple and commonplace in the original text, becomes a great mansion with spacious halls, for the mighty Chief, in the old Saxon's ideas, would surely not deign to make merry in any but a lordly house. The feasting scene is thoroughly national. The guests, partly seated on benches, partly roaming through the large hall, the mighty tankards (*alofatun*—ale vats the original calls them), the bustling cup-bearers, the merry company—all these are characteristic additions to the unadorned story in the Gospel. They exhibit the creative side of the poet and interest us as pictures of old German—not Jewish—life. They are incorrect, as the costumes and paraphernalia of Raphael's Madonnas are incorrect, but they give life and vigor to the poem.

We see, then, how truly "The Heliand" reflects the manners and the ideas of the people among which it originated. Another feature showing the same tendency is the loyalty of the writer to the Emperor and his vigorous insistance upon obedience to his authority. The Saxons had resisted Charlemagne to the utmost, but when at last their Duke Widukind recognized the imperial sovereignty he did so honorably and loyally. This spirit of loyalty, the many favors conferred on the Church by the Carlovingian house, as well as the consistent teaching of the Church, dictated the following passage. Possibly, too, it was inspired by the fact that the poem was suggested by the widow of Louis the Pious. At all events, it is an interesting expression of the author's views on the duty of the faithful to governors:

Among the people there a haughty warrior;
The King's retainer saw they; he was Cæsar's
Servant, said he, the wielder of his power.
Next Simon Peter he addressed; declared
He had been sent to warn all men to pay

Their tithes, the taxes due the Emperor's court.
"To pay them with his choicest treasures no man
Tarries a day; thy Master all alone
Forbears to pay them. Certes imperial Cæsar,
My lord, will not be pleased to hear these tidings."
Forthwith went Peter then to tell his Lord,
But Christ already knew his message; naught
From Him was hid: He knew the minds of all.
He bade his far-famed liege-man Simon Peter
Take out his net and throw it in the sea.
"The first fish thou wilt catch draw from the water
And cleave its chin, then find within its jaw
Some golden coin. This take at once and pay
Thy tithes and mine, just as the man demands."
Forth went the fisherman, good Simon Peter.
Into the sea, the waves, he flung his net,
Drew up with both his hands a struggling fish;
Then clove its chin, and from within its jaw
Took out the golden coin. Whate'er the Son
Of Man had bidden him to do he did.
Thus glorified was Christ's almighty power,
And shown how all shall pay the debt, the tithes,
Whatever they may owe unto their liege-lord.
Never withhold from him his dues, nor yet
Contemn him in your hearts, but generous be
To him in mind and serve him faithfully.
Thus will you do God's will and eek obtain
The emperor's favor.

—Heliand II., 3183-3225.

The Carlovingian house, Pepin, Charles and his son Louis, had ever been loyal sons of the Church and protectors of the Holy See. St. Boniface and his successors had borne the glad tidings of the Gospel to the pagans of Germany, commissioned by the Pope himself. Loyal faith to St. Peter's successor inspired the converted and their spiritual guides. The evidence of this feeling is manifest in "The Heliand." Next to Christ Peter, it is true, is the most striking character in the Gospel narrative. But this prominence the poet of "The Heliand" strongly accentuates. This is already clear from some of the excerpts cited above, notably in the story of Peter's smiting of Malchus. Even more marked is this admiration, coupled with a certain loving sympathy in the verses which relate how Christ gave to Peter the power of the keys. As it is, moreover, from a literary point of view one of the most striking passages in the poem, we do not hesitate to subjoin it:

Then spake again the Christ, the Lord all-powerful:
"Who say ye that I am, retainers mine,
Dear men?" Not backward then was Simon Peter;
Quick answered he, the one for all; for bold
Was he of spirit, had a daring heart,
And was most loyal to his Lord and King:
"Thou art in very truth the All-Ruler's Son,
Son of the living God, who made this world,
Christ, everlasting King; so say we, all
Thy followers, that Thou art God Himself,
The best of Saviours." Then in turn replied
His Lord: "Full blest art, Simon, thou, the son
Of Jonas. Not in thy thoughts nor thy mind
Hast thou conceived this answer; no man's tongue
Revealed it to thee, but Almighty God,
The Father. Thee of all the sons of men
Hath He inspired to speak so plainly now
The truth mysterious; great thy reward.
Pure is the faith thy soul hath in the Lord.

Thy soul is like a flint; firm like a rock
Art thou; hence men shall call thee Holy Peter,
And on this rock will I erect my Church,
God's holy house. There shall his household ever
Gather in happiness. Against thy mighty power
Ne'er shall the gates of hell prevail. To thee
I give the keys of heaven, that after Me
Thou mayest sway the Christian nations all,
That unto thee go forth men's spirits alway.
Great be thy power. Whom of the sons of men
Thou choose to bind here on the earth, to him
Is heaven locked, and hell to him is opened
The burning fire; and whom thou wilt unbind,
Loosen his hands, to him is heaven unlocked,
The realm of light and everlasting life,
God's verdant pasture. This is my reward
For thy strong faith. Not yet shalt thou make known
To these men here, this throng, that I am the Christ,
Mighty, God's only Son. Me guiltless shall
Hereafter put in gyves the Jews and torture
Beyond belief. Much suffering they'll inflict
Upon me with the spear; they will assail
My life with keenest glaive and shed my blood.
But on the third day from the dead I'll rise
And to the earth return through our Lord's power."
Then great alarm the best of liegemen seized,
Good Simon Peter: terror filled his heart,
And to his Lord the hero spoke in secret.
"Ne'er will Almighty God," quoth he, "the All-Ruler,
Permit that Thou, my Lord, shall suffer torture
So great among these folk: no need is there
For this, my holy Lord." To him replied
His Lord, the famed, the mighty Christ, for gracious
Was He to Peter: "What! wouldst thou oppose
My will, thou best of liegemen? Well thou know'st
The weakness of the people here, but not
The strength of God, that I must show to men.
In truth I tell thee that among these men,
These followers of mine, some will not die,
Not go to the hereafter, till they see
The light of heaven and God's own kingdom."

—Heliand II., 3051-3107.

The last few lines refer to Christ's transfiguration, which follows directly after the scene just described and in which Peter again has a prominent share. It is impossible not to feel the closeness of the ties between Peter and Our Saviour while reading the recital just quoted, nor to admire the skill with which the poet impresses this upon us.

We have now a sufficiently clear insight into the method of our poet. We understand how he renders his story, so startlingly strange to his countrymen, less repellent, or rather how he enlists their sympathies on behalf of the Redeemer. He certainly shows no little genius in solving this problem. Without infringing on the essential truth of Christ's history, without lowering the Saviour's dignity and without introducing any elements that are ludicrous or grotesque, he presents to his hearers the overwhelming story of our redemption. Even to-day and on us who are so keenly sensitive to the slightest departures from correctness of local coloring, the poem makes an impression of grandeur and nobility. How much greater must have been the effect on those for whom it was written!

With the story of the visit of the three Magi to Bethlehem, which will enable the reader to appreciate the poet's manner of dealing with narrative passages and may be regarded not as a passage selected for its especial interest, but as a specimen of the general flow of his narrative, we close our extract:

Then from the temple and Jerusalem
Went Joseph home, and Mary, too, his spouse;
And in their company was e'er the King
Of Heaven, the Lord's own Son, of all the Guardian.
No further now the tidings of His birth
Spread through the world, for such was the decree
Of heaven's great King. Though all the good men there
Acknowledged Christ, yet at the royal court
The news reached not the men who in their hearts
Were bitter; hid from them remained the gladsome
Tidings until there came far from the East
Into that land three sages, men most wise
And warriors bold, by distant weary ways.
A brilliant star their guide, the Son of God
They sought with honest hearts and wished to bow
Their knees before Him, be His followers true.
God's will impelled them to the Holy Land,
And there they found the mighty Herod sitting
In lofty hall, the rudely spoken king,
The wrathful lord, surrounded by his henchmen.
At all times lusted he for gore and slaughter.
Then the good sages, using words most fair,
As it beseemed them speaking to the king,
Addressed him in his palace. Soon in turn
He asked what message they had brought, and questioned
The bold wayfarers. "Bring you wroughten gold
Or costly gifts for any man? And why
Have you come here by toilful travel? Look!
You come from distant lands, from nations strange.
Well-born you are, I see of noble stock;
Never before have men like you come hither
From other countries since I rule this people,
Govern this mighty realm. Now tell me truly,
Before these lords assembled, why ye came
To this my country?" Thereupon in turn
Spake out the Eastern heroes, men of wit.
"We will tell thee truly," quoth they, "what's our errand,
Say without guile why we have come upon
This voyage from the East to this thy land.
In bygone days there dwelt among us seers
Noble and wise, who told of future blessings,
Promised us help, in truthful words, from heaven.
Then, too, was there a learned man and sage
Full of experience. Long, yes, long ago
Lived this our ancestor in Eastern lands.
Never since then was there a man so wise
Of speech; the word of God would he make known
Because the Lord of men had given him power
To learn his words of wisdom here on earth.
Hence was his knowledge great, the hero's learning.
When came his time to go from hence, depart
From home and kin, to bid farewell to all
The bustling haunts of men, and seek the life
Beyond, he summoned to his side the youths
He had taught, his heirs, and truthfully foretold
To these, his scholars, all that since befell
Our land, that happened upon earth. He said
Unto this orb would come a king far famed,
Mighty, of lineage unexcelled, quoth, that
The Son of God He would be, quoth, that on earth
Forever He would rule and eke in heaven.
He said that on the very day His blessed
Mother would bear Him to this earth, that day
A brilliant star would in the Orient shine;
Such star as ne'er was seen 'twixt earth and heaven,
Nor elsewhere such a babe nor such a sign.

Enjoined that three men of our nation then
Set forth to adore Him; bade them bear in mind
His words when they beheld rise in the East
That sign from God; bade them prepare forthwith,
And bade us follow it where'er it led
Forward to western lands, in heaven above.
All this has happened now, and by the power
Of God has come to pass. Conceived and born
Is now the dauntless king and strong.
We saw His star resplendent shine in heaven, His sign
Even as the holy Lord Himself ordained,
The Mighty One Himself. From morn to morn
We saw His star refulgent blaze in heaven;
And hitherward o'er roads, through forests dense
We followed it for many days. Our ardent
Desire it was to see Him and to know
Where we should seek the King within this realm
Of Cæsar. Tell us now from which of all
These countless tribes has He been born?" In heart
Grew Herod sad, his mind was filled with care,
His thoughts were anxious; he had heard the sages
Declare that he must own an Over-Lord,
A king far mightier, of noble stock.
Among his liegemen stronger summoned he
Forthwith of all that in Jerusalem
Were dwelling, those well versed in foreign tongues,
In book lore wise. With eager words the king
Then questioned he this man of bitter spite,
The Jewish King, where Christ, the Prince of Peace,
Was to be born. In answer, then, at once
Spake forth these folk, these men of truth, and said
They knew that Christ was destined to be born
In Bethlehem. "'Tis written in our books,
Our sacred writings; so the prophets, too,
Far-seeing sages, men most wise, inspired
By God, foretold that to this world should come
From Bethlehem the Shepherd of our towns,
Our country's Guardian, dear and mighty Ruler,
Who is to sway the nation of the Jews,
And be a gracious gift to many tribes
Upon the earth." Then learnt I furthermore
That soon thereafter the sudden-minded king
Told to the travelers the prophet's words,
Even to the men that came from distant parts,
From foreign lands. Enquired he afterwards
When had they first beheld in Eastern climes
The royal star appear, the sign refulgent,
Blaze high in heavens. Nought desired they then
From Herod to withhold, but told the truth.
Then onward urged he them to fare, to sift
The truth of their strange tidings and the facts
About the coming of the child. The king,
The ruler of the Jews, then charged the three
Wise men, before they set out for the East,
To apprise him where the new-born King he'd seek
In his own palace, quoth, he wished to worship
The Child there with his courtiers, though he meant
With ruthless steel to kill the Babe divine.
But God, the All-Ruler, then made manifest
His power; again appeared above the clouds
The blazing sign. The three wise men prepared
To start forthwith. Thence traveled they in haste
Upon this errand, eager they to seek
The Son of God. No retinue had they.
The three were all alone. But wise they were,
And full of foresight, who had brought their gifts
To offer to the Lord of heaven and earth,
To watch where moved above the twinkling star,
God's sign. They soon beheld it there announcing
The Saviour's birth to all the world. Intently
They went where led the star, obeyed its guidance
With God's sure help until the way-worn men
Beheld at last the blazing sign of God
Halt high in heaven most brilliant o'er the house
Where dwelt the Holy Babe, flashed forth the star,

And where the Virgin Mother fondly nursed Him
As her beseemed. Joy thrilled the heroes' hearts,
For by this sign they knew that they had found
The Prince of Peace divine, the King of heaven.
The mansion then they entered, bearing gifts,
These way-worn wanderers, princes from the East,
And saw the Babe was Christ, the All-Ruler; then
The travelers fell on their knees before
The Babe, and as a King they greeted Him;
Brought Him their presents, gold and incense, symbols
Of Godship true, and myrrh they gave withal.
His men stood ready, loyal to their master,
And in their hands received the gifts so fair
In courtly ways. The wise men thereupon
Entered the house; the way-worn wayfarers
Entered the hall for guests. There in the night
God's angel in their sleep showed them a dream;
The Lord Himself had willed it so, the All-Ruler.
With mandate clear He bade them go from thence
By other ways and journey home, and shun
Herod on their return, that wicked-hearted man
And cruel, bloody king. Soon morning fair
Descended on the earth; the wise men then
Spoke of their dreams. The All-Ruler's mandate then
Clearly they recognized, for in them dwelt
Wisdom abounding. Next besought the Lord,
The King of heaven sublime, that they might still
Deserve His grace and do His will; each morn,
Said they, they turned their loyal minds to Him,
Their loyal hearts. Then went from thence the men,
The Eastern heroes, as God's angel bade them.

We have already said that mediæval chronicles contain no record of the appreciation in which "The Heliand" was held by its contemporaries and the middle ages in general. That it was well received and achieved the end for which it was written, we may perhaps infer from the fact that not long after its composition, indeed during the same tenth century, a similar poem was composed in the High German language, then in its infancy. This was the "Gospel Harmony" of Ottfried, a monk of Weissenburg, a town in Alsace. Besides the difference of dialect, what distinguishes Ottfried's work from "The Heliand" is the fact that it is written in rhymed and not in alliterative verse. Indeed it is perhaps the oldest German rhymed poem that has come down to us. However, modern critics unanimously agree that in poetic skill and inspiration the monk of Weissenburg ranks far below the author of "The Heliand." If "The Heliand" was soon lost sight of in the middle ages may probably be due to its dress. It is almost the last German poem written in alliterative verse, and such is the charm of rhyme, especially for less refined, that once the new kind of verse had been introduced into German literature, people lost their taste for the ancient unrhymed poetry.

We have spread before our readers the story of this most ancient specimen of Christian literature in Germany; we have striven to picture the conditions under which it was composed and the difficulties with which the old minstrel was forced to contend; we have sought to exhibit in a clear light the excellencies and weaknesses

of the epic, and we have even ventured in a modest translation to acquaint our readers with the stylistic peculiarities that characterize it. If by these means we have succeeded in enabling them to realize to some degree the fact that even in those early days Christianity inspired the old Saxon singer with true poetic feeling, and direct their attention to the many treasures of literature which mediæval Europe accumulated, we shall think that these pages have not been written in vain.

CHARLES G. HERBERMANN.

New York, N. Y.

Scientific Chronicle

SOME RECENT EXPERIMENTS AND LIFE.

Within the last few months many of our newspapers and magazines, in their inordinate desire for the sensational, have published remarkable stories of the production—"creation" some have called it—of life by artificial means. These stories they have attempted to substantiate by a description of one or other of two series of experiments carried on respectively by Mr. John Butler Burke at Cambridge, England, and by Professor Jacques Loeb, of the University of California. The experimenters themselves are not responsible for the exaggerated claims of these newspaper writers. Striking as their discoveries are, they do not appeal to those who know as settling the question of the origin of life; to some of these, indeed, that much-mooted problem is as far from an experimental solution as ever.

Dr. Burke is engaged in research work in the Cavendish Laboratory of Cambridge University. In the course of this work he was led to try the effect of a salt of radium on a gelatine culture medium, such as is used for generating bacteria in commonly known as bouillon. A small hermetically sealed tube containing salt (bromide of radium in one case, chloride in another) was placed in a tube of bouillon, which was in turn stopped up with cotton wool and sterilized at a temperature of about 130 degrees C. for about thirty minutes. This sterilization would effectually kill off all traces of organic life, for it will be remembered that Pasteur and others have established the fact that the highest temperature at which organic life is possible is 113 degrees F., or 45 degrees C. About two and one-half milligrams of the bromide were used, and the small sealed tubes were broken by means of a wire passing to the outside of the larger tube, allowing the salt to drop on the surface of the gelatine. After a lapse of twenty-four hours in the case of the bromide, and of three or four days for the chloride, a culture-like growth was observed in the gelatine which extended for a depth of a centimeter beneath the surface. That these were not organisms, left behind because of imperfect sterilization of the bouillon, was evidenced by the fact that "control" tubes of bouillon, sterilized as the others, but containing no radium, exhibited no trace of contamination after the same length of time.

The small bodies making up the growth were clearly not

microbes, neither bacteria, for they gave no sub-culture when transferred to fresh media; nor microbes of another kind, as after a month or six weeks the bodies resulting from their action were too small to be classed as microbes. When the original cultures were heated and resterilized the small bodies disappeared temporarily. Disappearance was likewise caused by the action of diffused daylight, but the bodies again made their appearance when the tubes were placed in the dark. A stronger proof that they were not microbes was that they dissolved in warm water. The suggestion that they might be crystals was made, but in Dr. Burke's opinion they could not be. They were too small, and the various phenomena of motion, growth, sub-division, etc., would preclude this explanation. Dr. Burke calls them "highly organized bodies," and he adds: "The stoppage of growth at a particular stage of development is a clear indication of a continuous adjustment of internal to external relations, and thus suggests vitality." He says that they cannot be identified with microbes on the one hand nor with crystals on the other, and dubs them "radiobes," the name suggesting their origin and resemblance to living cells. It seems clear from his writings that he would like to call them living things, for he says again: "The continuity of structure, assimilation and growth, and the sub-division, together with the nucleated structure as shown in a few of the best specimens, suggests that they are entitled to be classed among living things, in the sense in which we use the words, whether we call them bacteria or not."

We would like to point out just here to those who at once conclude that life has been at last produced artificially, that it will take more than a mere suggestion to establish such a tremendous conclusion. Various experimenters have succeeded in producing artificial cells that imitate living cells in many wonderful ways, but it is a long step from the imitation to the reality. The action and movements of the counterfeits can be readily explained by the action of known physical and chemical laws, and these "radiobes" are no exception. Sir William Ramsay, in an article in the *Independent*, has given an explanation that will appeal to an unbiased judgment as perfectly satisfactory. Calling to mind the fact that radium gives off helium by the decomposition of the radium emanation, that besides heat being evolved during this decomposition, a certain amount of chemical energy is liberated, which can bring about the decomposition of the water in which the emanation may be dissolved, that the dissolved emanation has the "curious property of coagulating white of egg or albumen, he continues: "A possible explanation appears to me to be suggested by some of the facts which I have adduced. Mr. Burke made use of solid radium

bromide in fine powder. He sprinkled a few minute grains on a gelatine broth medium, possibly somewhat soft, so that the granules would sink slowly beneath the surface. Once there they would dissolve in and decompose the water, liberating oxygen and hydrogen, together with emanations, which would remain mixed with these gases. The gases would form minute bubbles, probably of microscopic dimensions, and the coagulating action of the emanation on the albumen of the liquor would surround each with a skin, so that the product would appear like a cell; its contents, however, would be gas, or, rather, a mixture of the gases oxygen and hydrogen. The emanation, enclosed in such a sack, would still decompose water, for enough would diffuse through the walls of the sack, which, moreover, would naturally be moist. The accumulation of more gas would almost certainly burst the walls of the cell, and almost equally certainly in one or two places. Through the cracks a gas would issue, carrying with it the emanation, and with it the property of coagulating the walls of a fresh cell. The result of the original bubble would resemble an yeast cell, and the second cell a bud, or perhaps more than one if the original cell happened to burst. This process would necessarily be repeated as long as the radium continued to evolve emanation, which would be for the best part of a thousand years. The 'life,' therefore, would be a long one, and the 'budding' would impress itself on an observer as equally continuous with that of a living organism."

The experiments of Dr. Loeb had in view the solution of three problems—among others, hybridization, artificial parthenogenesis and animal heliotropism. In the first he succeeded in producing hybrids from two species of animals which were not closely related; in the third he made some interesting discoveries regarding the causes of the turning towards the light which certain animals exhibit. The second problem is the one which has particularly attracted the attention of the newspapers. Dr. Loeb wished to throw light on the question of parthenogenesis, that process by which the eggs of certain animals begin to segment without union with the sperm. Some animals do this naturally. The inquiry was, could it be brought about that animals whose eggs under natural conditions need union with the sperm in order to segment be made to develop without this union by chemical, physical or mechanical means? The experiments yield an affirmative answer. Eggs of *Arbacia* (one of the sea urchins) and of *Chaetopterus*, a marine worm, were caused to segment by merely increasing the concentration of sea water by the addition of magnesium, potassium, sodium or calcium chlorides. There was no "creation" of life. The eggs were already living. They were caused to divide by

artificial means, the stimulating effect of the spermatozoon in hastening segmentation and whatever other effect the spermatozoon might have being accomplished by the means described. For a complete review of these experiments the reader is referred to Dr. Loeb's two volumes of "Studies in General Physiology."

TERRESTRIAL MAGNETISM.

Under the auspices of the Carnegie Institution a systematic study of the problems of terrestrial magnetism is to be made. It may prove of interest to know the nature of the work to be accomplished. Something has already been done. The study of the secular variation of the earth's magnetism is well enough advanced to enable field work in this line to be carried on with success. Besides this, a work on the magnetic disturbance due to the eruption of Mount Pelée will be published this year. Of the work still to be accomplished there will be made a general study of the laws of diurnal variation and a special investigation of magnetic storms. Probably the most important portion of the work, at least from a practical standpoint, will be the magnetic survey of the Pacific Ocean. A special steamer will be devoted to this, and the declination, horizontal intensity, total intensity and dip will be accurately determined for the whole Pacific. There will be an investigation of magnetic disturbances carried on in conjunction with the Carnegie Solar Research Laboratory on Mount Wilson in California. Eclipse work was done on August 30 on the Island of Majorca.

CAPE TO CAIRO RAILWAY.

The completion of the bridge over the Zambesi river marks the completion of an important link in the great chain which will join the Cape with Cairo. The bridge is a steel arch of 500 feet span. The gorge of the river is 400 feet below and the depth of water estimated at several hundred feet. During the construction of the bridge a net was spread beneath the workmen and was the means of saving several lives. The journey to Cairo or the Cape is not all to be made by rail. Of the 5,611 miles to be traversed, 1,800 miles will be made by steamer; 400 of these will be made on Lake Tanganyika, the remainder on other lakes and the Nile. Two thousand seven hundred and seventy miles of the remaining rail route have been completed.

NEW FEATS IN WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

On a recent voyage the Campania kept up communication with Poldhu, Cornwall, until 2,100 miles out, and began to communicate with Nantucket, Massachusetts, when 1,800 miles from Sandy Hook. Experts say that she could have kept up communication with Europe for the whole of the voyage. M. Edouard Branly in some recent laboratory experiments showed that an operator with a wireless apparatus could start and stop an electric motor, turn on and off a system of incandescent lights and touch off an explosive mine. And he further showed that these, by a sort of attuning process, could be selected at will.

OXIDIZING ATMOSPHERIC NITROGEN.

Accounts have appeared at various times in these pages of methods devised to make the nitrogen of the atmosphere commercially available in fertilizers. In a recent method devised by Professor Eschweiler, of Hanover, a stream of air mixed with steam is passed over a mass of peat in a state of slow combustion. In the process the steam is decomposed, the hydrogen uniting with the nitrogen of the air and of the peat to form ammonia. The ammonia is then taken up by sulfuric acid. It has been claimed that the ammonium sulfate thus formed can be manufactured at a commercial price.

ASTRONOMICAL NOTES.

Recent Observations of Mars.—Professor Percival Lowell, of Flagstaff Observatory, Arizona, the eminent authority on the planet Mars, writes in regard to the new North Polar cap on the planet that he observed the first frost on May 19, which corresponds to August 20 on our calendar, and is 126 days after the summer solstice in the northern hemisphere of Mars. In 1903 the first frost effects were observed about 128 days after. On March 28 he telegraphed to Professor Pickering that some of the canals had been photographed by Mr. Lampland, some appearing on more than twenty plates. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Janssen Medal of the French Astronomical Society was awarded in 1904 to Professor Lowell for his work on Mars, it being the first

and only medal ever awarded for the study and interpretation of the surface features on Mars.

Solar Activity.—On July 6 to 13 a group of sunspots was visible which increased to roughly 100,000 miles in the aggregate and was visible to the naked eye. On July 10 smaller spots with two well defined nuclei appeared, and on July 14 both groups were visible to the properly protected naked eye at once, the second time this has occurred this year.

Observations of Jupiter's New Satellites.—It was announced on July 30 that Dr. Albrecht had observed the sixth satellite of Jupiter on three nights in July with the Crossley reflector of the Lick Observatory. With the same instrument he observed the seventh satellite on the 7th, 9th and 10th of August.

Some Refinements of Mechanical Science.—The above is a title of an address recently delivered by Mr. Ambrose Swasey, of the well-known firm of instrument makers of Cleveland, Ohio. In the course of the address he called attention to some recent feats in dividing and measuring linear valves. A plane surface on speculum metal was made recently by Brashear that was in error only one-four-hundred-thousandth of an inch. Regarding another similar feat we quote a paragraph from *Popular Astronomy:*

"Professor Michaelson conceived the idea that standards of length should be measured by wave lengths of light to be permanent in case of destruction. By the air of Mr. Brashear this work has been so successful that Professor Michaelson was invited to continue it at the Bureau of Weights and Measures at Sèvres, France, where the standard meter was kept in an underground vault and inspected only at long intervals or when needed for important tests. The final result of the experiments, which occupied nearly a year, shows that there are 1,553,164.5 wave lengths of red cadmium light in the French standard meter at 15 degrees centigrade. So great is the accuracy of these experiments that they can be repeated within one part in two millions."

Discovery of a Tenth Satellite to Saturn.—This has been discovered by Professor W. H. Pickering, who also discovered the ninth satellite to the same planet. This latest satellite is of the twentieth magnitude, has a period of 21 days and a direct orbital motion, as far as can be at present ascertained.

The Retirement of a Noted Astronomer.—The many students of Professor Charles A. Young's works on astronomy—and their number is legion—will learn with regret of his retirement from active teaching work at Princeton University, where he had been professor of astronomy and director of the Halstead Observatory for twenty-eight years. The event was noteworthy not only

from the fact that it marked the close of more than fifty years of devoted work in his favorite science, but also because of the position Professor Young held as a scientist, who united indefatigable industry and enterprise to a rarely discriminative judgment and a strict regard for truth in a remarkable way. Among his scientific achievements may be mentioned the first photograph of a solar prominence, made in 1870, which was not highly successful because of the limitations of the wet plate process; the development of the use of the spectroscope in astronomy and its application to the observation of the spectrum of the corona, and the first observation of the "flash spectrum." The dark lines of the normal solar spectrum have been supposed to be due to the absorption of the light emitted by the minute solid or liquid particles which go to form the photosphere, the absorption being made by a cooler layer, in which the photospheric clouds float and which is made up of the same vapors as the clouds themselves. If this is the case, if the photosphere could be cut off from view, we should obtain a bright spectrum of these same lines from that part of the cooler layer projecting beyond the photosphere. This projecting portion is seen in a favorable position for this observation at the time of a total eclipse of the sun for the few seconds the shadow of the moon is just tangent on the inside to the solar disk. It should then give a bright line spectrum. Professor Young first observed this spectrum, called the "flash spectrum" from the fact of its visibility for a few seconds only, in 1870. It was photographed in 1896 and 1898. One other pioneer work was Professor Young's measurement of the rotation of the sun by means of Doppler's principle, from the relative displacement of the lines of the spectrum on the approaching and receding limbs of the sun.

GEOLOGICAL NOTES.

Underground Water Resources of the Central Great Plains.—The Central Great Plains include the greater portions of South Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas and the eastern portions of Colorado and Wyoming, an area of about one-half million square miles. The strata of sandstone and sand, which overlie relatively impermeable shales and limestones, outcrop on the west of the region at an altitude of about 4,000 feet above sea level and slope to the east. The water evidently enters the sandstone at this outcrop, and in the trough of the central portion of the plains is under great pressure. The water in some wells that have been sunk is

under a pressure of one hundred and fifty pounds per square inch. In two it is slightly over two hundred. Over 1,000 wells east of the Missouri are estimated to flow 7,000,000 gallons a day. One well at Woonsocket, South Dakota, sent out a three-inch stream 97 feet into the air, while another at Springfield flows 3,292 gallons per minute.

Mineral Wealth of the United States.—According to statistics issued by the United States Census Bureau, the value of the mineral product in the United States during 1902 was more than $1,000,000,000. Of this amount nearly $290,000,000 represented the value of the bituminous coal mined; nearly $90,000,000 that of the gold and silver; the anthracite coal was worth somewhat over $75,000,000, the petroleum about $70,000,000 and the iron ore $65,000,000, approximately. The report noted the increased use of electricity in mining, due without doubt to the utilization of water courses for generative purposes.

The Largest Diamond.—A diamond has been recently found at the Premier Mine, Transvaal, which weighs 9,600.5 grains Troy, or 1.37 pounds avoirdupois, three times the weight of the largest previously known. It has been named the Cullinan.

GENERAL NOTES.

Upper Air Exploration by Kites Above the Atlantic.—In 1901 Mr. A. Lawrence Rotch, of the Blue Hill Observatory, flew a number of kites, with self-recording instruments attached, from a transatlantic steamer and obtained some valuable data about the circulation of the air in the higher regions of the atmosphere. In 1904 Professor Hergesell, on board the Prince of Monaco's Princess Alice, conducted a series of similar experiments above that portion of the Atlantic bounded by Spain, the Canaries and the Azores. An expedition has set out this year to repeat the above experiments and continue them further southward, and will proceed towards the equator by way of Madeira, the Canary and Cape Verde Islands. Hydrogen balloons will be used to supplement the kites. Mr. Henry H. Clayton, meteorologist at Blue Hill, made some flights on his passage across the Atlantic on the Romanic.

Meeting of the British Association in South Africa.—The British Association for the Advancement of Sciene met this year at South Africa. The inaugural address of Professor G. H. Darwin, son of the great naturalist, was delivered partly at Cape Town on August 15 and partly at Johannesburg on August 30. The various

other addresses were delivered in these two places and in others to which the party proceeded. Several American scientists, among them Professor W. M. Davis, of Harvard, and Professor Scott, of Princeton, were among the delegates.

The American Medical Association.—This association, which is gradually uniting the 140,000 physicians in this country into a compact body, held its annual meeting during the week of July 10 at Portland, Oregan. The new president is Dr. William J. Mayo, of Rochester, Minn., one of the foremost among American surgeons. He has persistently declined all calls to large cities or institutions, and has remained in a small town, which boasts of a hospital—St. Mary's—built by the Franciscan Sisters for his father, and where he is one of the surgeons. The doctors present at the meeting devoted a whole morning to the discussion of the work of Dr. Chittenden, of which an account was given in the Chronicle of the October issue of the Quarterly, and which will have a marked influence on future medical practice in regard to nutrition.

M. J. Ahern, S. J.

Boston College, Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews

THE GENTLE SHAKESPERE. A vindication. By *John Pym Yeatman*, of Lincoln's Inn, Esquire, etc., author of the "History of the Common Law of Great Britain," etc. Third edition (augmented). 8vo., pp. about 475. New York: The Shakespere Press. Birmingham: Moody Brothers.

This is a remarkable book in more ways than one. It is a formidable looking volume, and one's first thought in regard to it, that it contains the life work of a Shakespere student who has devoted much time to study and research. But at the very beginning he is met with this statement by the author: "I have written this book with but very little preparation, and with only a previous very general knowledge of the work of Shakespere." Before one has quite recovered from his surprise, he is still more startled to learn that just three weeks were spent in the making, and that the purpose of the author is to correct the errors of others with an unsparing hand. Here are his words:

"The book has taken me just three weeks to write. In it I have somewhat boldly attempted to correct the errors of others with an unsparing hand, but only with a view to the elucidation of the truth. If others will take the trouble to take the rod in hand, and correct mine, I shall not repine. I am not ashamed to confess that reading Mr. Donelly's book I accepted much of its conclusions; although by testing his 'cryptogram' I soon found it to be nonsense, and now, through this investigation, I have discovered the absurd blunders upon which his arguments are based, I entirely reject his teaching, and can only wonder that I could have been misled by it. It is with great satisfaction that I bring these facts to light, and assist in some measure to sweep away the rubbish that has been heaped upon the grave of William Shakespeare, not by Donelly only, but by the many who have rashly ventured to write about him."

The unsparing hand is very much in evidence here, and no doubt the author's wish that his errors shall be corrected by others, even as he corrects the errors of others, will be fully gratified.

The book is made up of several parts not necessarily connected and with a quotation of the first four acts of "Henry VIII." almost entire. We have culled from the preface of the book proper a group of quotations which follow one another so closely as to form a consecutive whole, and they summarize pretty completely the text that follows:

"One of the objects of this book is to place before the reader a true account of a great poet—the greatest, perhaps, that the world

ever saw—and, if possible, to relieve his memory from the mass of misrepresentation, calumny and even unreasoning adulation which has been piled upon it.

"As most certainly no one man ever brought together so many beautiful and noble ideas, or expressed them so worthily or so naturally, no one has ever yet excited so much comment and inquiry, or has caused such a multitude of books to be written about himself and his works, it might be thought that it is superfluous and unnecessary to add another to the pile; that the limit of the great library which has been created to his honor has been reached, and that the wise gentlemen who have assumed to themselves the power of controlling thought and of defining theories respecting William Shakespere—in other words, of settling controversies and stifling honest discussion—should be respected in their office and troubled no more with 'vague possibilities and wild conjectures;' but in truth the true limit of discussion has not been closed; nay, it has hardly been reached, for the simple reason that as yet, despite the multitude of accounts we possess, there are none based upon the truth; the premises upon which they are built have been wrongly assumed. We know almost as little of the true man as if he had been a myth. Indeed, some of the shrieking schools declare that as an author he had no existence; that there was such a man as Will Shakespere is not absolutely denied, but that he ever wrote a line of the magnificent lyrics called his, or of the marvelous plays which have been published under his name, they utterly deny. There was, indeed, it may be conceded, a common, indeed, a very common and improper person, called William Shakespere in the time of Queen Elizabeth, a low drinking, pot-house fellow; he may have been an actor (but if such only a poor one); he was an intelligent rustic who lived in pot-houses and usually slept under hedges after his carousals, and they point with satisfaction, and in proof, to a certain crabapple tree (in Warwickshire) still called after his name, and, sad to say, loved by the common people because it is said that the drunken lout once slept under it.

"Perhaps more objectionable than the shrieking school, because more misleading, are the orthodox writings of the sages—the self-constituted 'authorities on Shakespere'—of whom Halliwell-Phillips is a mighty chieftain. They write with authority; they have in their breast all that can possibly be known concerning the man. No one can, or shall, go a step further in the search of truth concerning him. But, alas! reading these great authorities does not bring either conviction or peace to the mind."

In a very able and interesting review in the QUARTERLY of April, 1864, the writer remarked: "How few of all who read Shake-

spere's works have any conception of the man. He who of all poets comes nearest home to us, with his myriad touches of nature, is the most remote in his own personality," and he adds, "the sonnets of Shakespere afford us, if we can but understand them aright, the most certain means whereby we can get at the man. Our difficulty is to get the right interpretation of the sonnets, and know where Shakespere is really speaking in his own person."

There is an almost insuperable barrier to this mode of measuring their author. We have not a perfect copy of his poems, nor have we an undiluted copy of his plays. Unhappily Shakespere did not publish either in his lifetime, nor, so far as we know, did he leave any manuscript prepared or intended for publication behind him. We do not even know positively whether he ever contemplated publication.

Shakespere was tolerated, though a Catholic, because of his inimitable wit and lively humor, which pleased even the proud Protestant Queen, and curiously several of the players, some of his own relations and associated with him, were Catholics like him and were driven to this life probably from the fact that no other was open to them. In it they were tolerated on account of their cleverness, for although some of them were members of the University, they could not practice at the bar or in the other learned professions. We shall see presently how Shakespere hated Queen Elizabeth, in spite of her toleration and her patronage to himself, with the hate of one of a proscribed sect.

When we remember that he was a Catholic, and that his mother and her family were strict Catholics, that his father's family must have been intensely Catholic from the fact—which will be shown presently—that they were closely connected with a monastic institution, and that they lost their income, their homes and their position through the "Reformation," we cannot doubt as to the mode of his bringing up; and it must be remembered that, although in principle a Catholic, yet mixing as he did in the world, he might have been a Protestant in his practices.

Surely it is a great thing to know that the poet came of an ancient and honored race, and that if the story of his youthful indiscretions have not been highly colored because of his renown—little people are so fond of sticking their own weaknesses upon the characters of the great—that at all events they were not hereditary or family faults, but the outcome of an exuberant temperament, unhappily unchecked by proper control, and let us hope that these bad habits were thrown off—if they ever existed—as quickly as they were assumed. Let us get at the fact that our poet was a gentleman by birth and education, and decent people will only too gladly throw

a veil over his youth and regard him as the pure and honorable man that he was when he came to the years of discretion, and utterly disregard and repudiate the slanders and detractions of his enemies and pretended friends. Well might he exclaim in reference to so many of his late admirers: "Oh, save me from my friends."

"LES SAINTS:" Saint Columban (vers. 540-615), par l'Abbe Eug. Martin, pp. vi., 198. Saint Francis de Borgia (1510-1572), par Pierre Suau, pp. v., 204. Lecoffre, 90 Rue Bonaparte, 1905.

These two latest additions to the well-known series "The Saints" have a special importance not less from an apologetical than from a devotional and historical point of view. All heroes of sanctity are, of course, living embodiments of the efficacy and in so far also of the reality and rationality of Catholic faith; but the giant form of the great Irish missionary Columbanus stands out with peculiar lustre in the midst of an age of darkness—radiant with the power that made him an apostle of faith, that proved its validity by marvelous deeds of beneficence for the temporal as well as the spiritual lives of his contemporaries. On the other hand, the illustrious Borgia exhibits the personal argument for faith with special cogency at a time when the very splendors of purely secular culture seemed to blind the sight of vast multitudes of men to the argument of things that appear not and the substance of things that are only hoped for.

Columbanus precedes St. Benedict as the great promotor of the monastic life and the Christian civilization which it produced and developed in the West. He did not confine himself to peopling monasteries with choirs of the devout. His cloisters were the universal seminaries whence issued the saviors of civil society. He furnished priests and Bishops and apostles no less than the judges and protectors of secular life. In the luminous pages of his recent biography the figure of this great representative of early Western monasticism is seen in its heroic mould and its striking historic background. At the same time the portrait is not idealistic. The author is no mere panegyrist. In Columbanus no less, probably more than in most other saints, sanctity covered a man. The ardent apostle was exceedingly human. He had strange peculiarities, we may call them eccentricities, which it is hard from our times and standards to explain. These human elements in the saint's character are given, it need hardly be said, their due proportion in the present biography, and when thus seen in their true relation they rather enlarge than diminish their possessor, while they certainly bring him closer to the reader's capacity of appreciation and

possibilities of imitation—a position the attainment of which is, after all, the ultimate purpose of "the lives of the saints."

What may be called the realistic side of biography—a feature that particularly characterizes this series of biographies—is notably exemplified in Père Suau's "Life of St. Francis Borgia." There are a number of other biographies of the saint, but they are for the most part engrossed with his religious life. They take their subject mainly at his conversion and passing over his prior career follow him during his subsequent occupations as a member and general of the Society of Jesus. The present biography devotes about half of its space to his earlier history—to his home life, his life at the Spanish court prior to his conversion and to his character and deeds as a political ruler—while the second half, treating mainly of his career as a disciple of St. Ignatius, keeps close to the actual historical surroundings wherein he labored. This concreteness of method enables one to see the relations of the saint to his environment, and yet it in no wise lessens one's realization of the supernatural character and power of his interior life.

While there is an obvious advantage in reading these biographies in the original French, it is to be hoped that they will soon be given a wider circulation by a worthy English translation.

ST. CATHERINE DE RICCI. Her Life, Her Letters, Her Community. By *F. M. Capes.* Preceded by a Treatise on the Mystical Life, by F. Bertrand Wilberforce, O. P., Preacher General of the Order. 8vo., xlv.+282. Burns & Oates, London, W.

"St. Catherine de Ricci, one of the three canonized Dominican women of the 'Third Order,' holds a different position from that of either her great predecessor and namesake of Siena or the saint of the New World who was a little girl when she died, Rose of Lima. These two were 'tertiaries' in the strict sense of the word, remaining inmates of their respective parent houses to the end of their lives.

"St. Catherine de Ricci, on the contrary, was not only a 'conventual' tertiary, but she belonged to a community which, although of the third order, was enclosed behind a grille and led a strictly contemplative life. Its members had nothing to do with hospitals, orphanages, schools or any kind of charitable institutions, doing no 'active' work except what was absolutely needful for their own support—such as needlework or confectionery, etc., which they sold, and even these occupations were lessened as far as possible under Catherine's rule, to give more time for prayer. In fact, had it not been that their constitutions were of a less severe nature as to fast and abstinence, the sisters of her convent might almost as well have

belonged to the second order as to the third. Hence it is as a model rather of a contemplative nun than of what we in England usually understand by a conventual tertiary that this contemporary of St. Philip Neri and St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi must be regarded.

"Again, wide as was her acquaintance with 'seculars' of every kind, so that her life was by no means a hidden one, like St. Rose's, the nun of Prato was not a great historical character like St. Catherine of Siena, whose wonderful vocation was clearly inconsistent with a cloistered life. Catherine de Ricci had great fame in her own country, but it was more for her extraordinary mystical life than for any of her personal actions that people were drawn to her, at least to begin with; though, when they came to know her, the beauty of her character and the good that she did to others with true Dominican activity of mind and heart warmly attached them to her. She was a prioress of her convent for a great part of her life, and as such was renowned for her wise and holy government. Thus her position with regard to the public lies, as it were, between that of the other two saints. Her life, we may say, contains a triple interest—that of a pure mystic, that of a practical religious superior in her own community and that of an essentially loving and tender woman, spreading beneficent influence around as far as the circumstances of her calling allowed."

The book is made up largely of the letters of the saint.

"These letters form, it need hardly be said, a particularly valuable portion of the present work, by enabling the saint to speak to us herself from behind her grille of three centuries ago. It would perhaps be impossible to characterize them more truly than a Dominican doctor in theology, Pere Berthier, has done in this pithy antithesis: 'These simple and practical letters of the nobly-born Catherine de Ricci form a fitting pendant to the grand—we might almost say aristocratic—style of Catherine of Siena, the dyer's daughter.'"

HANDBOOK OF HOMERIC STUDY. By *Henry Browne, S. J., M. A.*, New College, Oxford Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland, Professor of Greek at University College, Dublin. With twenty-two plates. 12mo., pp. 333. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York and Bombay. 1905.

"An apology can hardly be required for any effort, however feeble, towards lessening the difficulties of Homeric study and making it a little more intelligent. In his two-fold capacity of learner and teacher, the writer has found that at the very threshold of his task a student is confronted with a mass of complex problems which hardly grow less entangled as he proceeds. He cannot

ignore them if he would, unless he be contented with merely translating the poetry line by line; his ordinary commentaries, handbooks of literature and history, his very dictionaries teem with allusions to controversial topics, and may often contain statements which are mutually destructive as well as overconfident. In this matter of decisiveness there is a danger of defect as well as of excess, and I can scarcely hope in my own pages to have steered successfully between the two extremes. On the one hand, it is less important for a beginner to have a cut and dried solution of his difficulties (even were this possible) than to feel their true inwardness, to recognize the mutual relations and to grasp the lines by which he might hope to reach a tolerable solution of them. Hence it has been constantly my concern to lay before the reader the elements out of which could be formed a judgment of his own, rather than to force him to conclusions to which I find myself inclined.

This outline of the author's purpose must command the approval of every teacher and student, for it goes to the very foundation of education—the training of the mind. Of course we abstract for the moment from moral training. It is not our purpose, nor have we the time or space to review this book in detail, but a glance at the very first page convinces us by analogy that the author is a true teacher. He says:

"With regard to the Iliad and Odyssey it will suffice at the outset to give a few descriptive remarks which may help towards that single and comprehensive view of the poems which it is not easy on account of their length and complexity for the beginner to acquire, and without which he will hardly approach his subject with intelligence and zest."

That is exactly what our teacher of Virgil did not do for us, and we can never quite forgive him the weary months of drudgery which followed as we groped in the dark, jumping foolishly from book six to book twelve, and then back to book two, and *finally* ending with book one.

We realize from experience the necessity of a handbook like the one before us, and we hope that it will brighten the pages which too often in our schools and colleges are dark almost to blackness.

LETTERS ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By *F. M. De Zulueta, S. J.* 8mo., pp. 414. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago. 1905.

"The volume here presented consists of little else than a reprint, with slight rearrangement, of the 'Letters on Christian Doctrine'

which for a few years past have been appearing monthly in the pages of the *Stella Maris* magazine, supplement to the English *Messenger of the Sacred Heart.* These 'letters' are here collected for the first time by the kind permission of Father D. Bearne, S. J., editor of both the aforesaid monthlies.

"It seems but due to the widely cherished memory of the late Father John G. Gretton, S. J., that the writer should disabuse his many kind and encouraging readers in the past of any impression they may have gathered that with him originated the idea of issuing 'letters' of the present kind. It was Father Gretton who conceived the same and embodied it in a series of 'Monthly Letters to Catholic Seamen,' published in a leaflet form at the *Messenger* office, Wimbledon. The writer did no more than take up the work at the point where Father Gretton had discontinued it—namely, at the end of the Third Commandment of the Decalogue—and at a time when the original leaflet had, under Father Bearne's editorship, developed into a prosperous magazine—the *Stella Maris.*

"But as the said monthly leaflets were penned chiefly for seamen, it seemed advisable for the purpose of this collection to rewrite the explanations of the first three Commandments, as well in order to meet the needs of a wider and more miscellaneous circle of readers as for giving greater homogeneity of treatment to the whole series.

"The aim of these 'Letters on Christian Doctrine' is to supplement the more elementary instruction in Catholic belief and morals which is afforded by the ordinary annotated Catholic catechism, and in some respects to go beyond the range of excellent manuals of religious instruction in which the catechism receives fuller development. This programme clearly implies that the present letters are designed mainly for such as are already past childhood, and who are either drawing towards full age or perhaps have already entered upon the serious work of life."

The series is confined to the Commandments of God and the precepts of the Church.

THE VALERIAN PERSECUTION. A study of the relations between Church and State in the third century, A. D. By *Rev. Patrick J. Healy, D. D.*, of the Catholic University of America. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., The Riverside Press, Cambridge.

"Recent investigation into the relations between the Christian Church and the Roman State during the first three centuries of our era has thrown much new light on the history of this long period of persecution, and has served to show that the opposition to Christianity on the part of the Roman authorities arose from deep-seated adherence to time-honored state policy rather than from

blind hatred for the followers of the new religion. This view of the subject does not tend to diminish belief in the intensity and bitterness of the struggle, while it brings into clearer light the herculean task which confronted the first Apostles of Christianity in promulgating doctrines which were to revolutionize all old ideas regarding the political, social, moral and religious relations of mankind. Bearing in mind the peculiar character of pagan society in antiquity, its cohesiveness and absolutism, and its claims to complete domination over all human affairs, it will be manifest how easily a propaganda which aimed at disintegrating this autocratic exercise of power could be construed into treason to the state. The persecution which took place during the reign of the Emperor Valerian was, in a sense, the most critical period in the history of the Church during the first three centuries. The policy of complete extermination formulated by the Emperor Decius, which was the first systematic attempt to destroy Christianity, was never adequately tested, as the premature death of that Emperor prevented the full carrying out of his plans. In the case of Valerian the same policy prevailed; it was in force for a longer period, and it was put into operation at a time when the Church was still staggering under the blows inflicted by Decius. The meagre list of martyrs whose names are known to us as victims of this persecution affords no indication as to the actual number of those who suffered death, banishment or confiscation at the hands of the Roman authorities. There is no complete history in English of these three centuries of Christian trial. In fact, outside the pages of M. Paul Allard's monumental work on the persecutions there is no systematic presentation of this subject in any language."

If apology were needed for the appearance of this book, sufficient has been said. The subject is intensely interesting; the author wrote under the direction of the best masters at the Catholic University of America; his style is simple, clear and very attractive, and his references are numerous and, we are willing to believe, accurate. Such a combination ought to produce good historical work. It has done so.

ENGLISH MONASTIC LIFE. By *Abbot Gasquet, O. S. B., D. D., D. Litt., F. R. Hist. S.* Second edition, revised. 8vo., pp. xix.+325. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago.

Anything from the learned pen of the Abbot Gasquet is sure of a royal welcome, because his reputation for accurracy is beyond question. In the present instance his work is fully as accurate as usual, though not so learned, because the purpose did not demand it, as may be gleaned from the preface:

"This volume does not appear to call for any lengthy preface. It should introduce and explain itself, inasmuch as, beyond giving a brief account of the origin and aim of each of the orders existing in England in pre-Reformation days, and drawing up a general list of the various houses, all I have attempted to do is to set before the reader, in as plain and popular a manner as I could, the general tenor of the life lived by inmates in any one of those monastic establishments. In one sense the picture is ideal, that is, all the details of the daily observance could not perhaps be justified from an appeal to the annals or custumals of any one single monastery. Regular or religious life was never, it must be borne in mind, such a cast-iron system, or of so stereotyped a form that it could not be, and for that matter frequently was, modified in this or that particular, according to the needs of places, circumstances and times. Even in the case of establishments belonging to the same order or religious body this is true, and it is, of course, all the more certainly true in regard to houses belonging to different orders. Still, as will be explained later, the general agreement of the life led in all the monastic establishments is so marked that it has been found possible to sketch a picture of that life which, without being perhaps actually exact in every particular for any one individual house, is sufficiently near to the truth in regard to all the houses in general. The purposes for which the various parts of the monastery were designed and were used, the duties assigned to the numerous officials, the provisions by which the well-being and order of the establishment were secured, the disposition of the hours of the day and the regulations for carrying out the common conventual duties, etc., were similar in all religious bodies in pre-Reformation days, and, if regard be paid to the changed circumstances, are still applicable to the monastic and religious establishments now existing in England."

The illustrations, especially those showing the costumes of the various orders, add much to the value of the work, while the list of English religious houses has great historic value. A series of maps follows this list, showing the location of the houses of the different communities.

THE STORY OF THE CONGO FREE STATE. Social, Political and Economic Aspects of the Belgian System of Government in Central Africa. By *Henry Wellington Wack, F. R. G. S.* (member of New York Bar). 8vo., pp. xv., 634. With 125 illustrations and maps. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

"As a student of Mid-African affairs for the past seven years, and a close observer of the rapid progress toward complete civilization now being made in that part of the world, I have felt it my duty to

lay before my countrymen the true and complete story of the conception, formation and development of the Congo Free State." The author goes on to state how he was moved to take up this work by the campaign of calumny being carried on by English merchants interested in the rubber trade, against King Leopold's government, which they accused of cruelty and oppression. In this compaign they made use of English religious organizations, and not satisfied with the harm they were doing at home, they extended the campaign to this country. It was then that the present work was undertaken in the interest of truth.

The author tells how he obtained from King Leopold, after presenting the proper credentials, free access to the archives of the administration of the Congo Free State in Brussels, and how he was left free to write the story in his own way, without interference or suggestion from the King or any of his ministers. The result is a true story, told in a most interesting manner, and of real historic value. The author says: "That this story is true, I have satisfied myself in every particular. It is the story of a great colonizing undertaking founded upon modern social science." Here we see the Catholic missionary at his best, for the story of the Congo Free State civilization is a story of Catholic civilization. The illustrations are admirably done.

SAINTS AND FESTIVALS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By *H. Pomeroy Brewster*, author of "The Cross in Iconography," etc. 8vo., pp. 558. Illustrated. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company.

The history of the book is told in the following words from the publisher's note:

"A considerable part of the matter presented in the following pages was printed in a series of articles in the *Union and Advertiser*, of Rochester, N. Y.

"The absolute truthfulness of these articles from both archæological and historic standpoints as well as their entire freedom from all denominational bias, with the knowledge of profane and ecclesiastical history and canon law shown in them, at once attracted a wide circle of readers and won the hearty approval of the clergy and laity of both Protestant and Roman branches of the Christian Church. On their completion, at the request of many eminent divines, the author has carefully revised the entire work, adding to the original MSS. much valuable material, and he has thus produced what is practically a Church year book, in which is told the origin, history and present status of each of the chief festivals of the entire Christian Church as well as of a number of local feasts and festivals which

obtain in certain parts of Europe. While it is beyond the scope of the present work to attempt to tell the story of every one of the numerous canonized saints whom the Church has chosen to honor, the author has each day throughout the year selected a few of the most noted among them and made brief sketches of the lives of those who are remembered on that day. But in the alphabetical index are given the name and 'saint-day' of a far more comprehensive list, while in the general index will be found the names of those especially mentioned."

The book is extremely interesting and instructive, and is particularly notable for the explanations with which it abounds of ancient customs, odd terms and doubtful symbols. The quaint illustrations, made especially to accompany the text and very seldom met with elsewhere, add a great deal to the value of the work. The author shows real love for his subject by his extensive research.

NOTES ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By *Most Rev. Edward G. Bagshawe, D. D.*, Archbishop of Seleucia. Second edition. 12mo., pp. 287. London: Kegan Paul; Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., Dryden House, 43 Gerbard street, London, W.

"The following 'Notes on Christian Doctrine' are notes from which about forty years ago I gave lectures on Christian doctrine to the students at Hammersmith Training College. I endeavored to put into a small compass as many theological truths, dogmatic and moral, as circumstances permitted. I have done my best, both then and in a recent revision, to make them exact and correct. How far I have succeeded it is for others to judge."

These notes are necessarily brief, covering as they do so wide a field. They include the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Angelic Salutation, the Commandments, the sacraments and the sacramentals. For the same reason they are confined to short but clear statements of doctrine without going into argument or quotation. As a brief summary they are excellent.

LIVES OF THE ENGLISH MARTYRS. Declared blessed by Pope Leo XIII. in 1886 and 1895. Written by the Fathers of the Oratory, of the Secular Clergy, and of the Society of Jesus. Completed and edited by Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B., of Erdington Abbey. Vol. II., "Martyrs Under Queen Elizabeth." 8vo., pp. xliii.+691. Burns & Oates, Ltd., London.

As was said here when he first volume of this work was noticed, the record is a sad but inspiring one. It brings before us in a startling manner the blinding power of lust which lay at the foundation of the English Reformation—so-called—and the small number

of the elect. At the same time it shows us the power of faith which can move mountains to the astonishment of the shallow-minded, but which can strengthen the martyr to give up his life, on the gallows or at the stake, without exciting more than ridicule in the worldling. For the true Christian, however, these pages are full of inspiration. In these martyrs he sees his brethren, the worthy successors of the early heroes of Christianity, who preach to him patience and perseverance from their thrones in heaven. The publication of their lives in this form at the present time is particularly appropriate for England, where serious minded men are turning their thoughts in ever increasing number towards the mother Church, from whose bosom their ancestors were torn or driven. We need such narratives in our own midst, because we are very far away from the spirit of sacrifice which leads to the martyr's crown.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII RECITANDI MISSAEQUE CELEBRANDIAE, etc. Pro anno Domini MCMVI. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

We were agreeably surprised by the arrival of this Ordo at this time. As the year draws to a close the need of the Ordo for the following year becomes more and more imperative. Indeed, it is hard to make arrangements for coming events without it. Pustet & Co. are noted for their promptness in this regard, and we congratulate them on living up to their reputation.

The Ordo is published in two forms—with and without the Roman office. We feel that it would be superfluous to speak of its intrinsic merits. Its history does that most eloquently. The publishers entered this field a few years ago, when it was already occupied by some one else who had been in possession from time immemorial. They have won the confidence of the ecclesiastical body very rapidly, and they have the expressed approbation of sixteen Bishops in addition to His Grace of New York. Their circle of readers widens each year, and no one who has used the book will need urging to induce him to continue. Orders may be sent at once to the publishers.

70763

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

PERIODICAL